

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,031, Vol. 40.

July 31, 1875.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE GOVERNMENT AND MR. PLIMSOLL.

THE Government was soon made aware of the greatness of the mistake into which it had been betrayed when it decided to abandon the Merchant Shipping Bill for the year. It is not often that the nation, irrespectively of party, awakes into a sudden fit of enthusiasm; nor, when it does grow enthusiastic, does it often show its feelings so quickly and so powerfully as it has done in the last week. Mr. DISRAELI has had a long Parliamentary experience, and he is studiously anxious to consult the wishes of every one, and to anticipate the direction of popular feeling. If any one was unlikely to have made the mistake he made, it was Mr. DISRAELI; and he has given a new proof that neither age nor experience, nor a desire to please, can enable a Minister accurately to gauge the tides of national sentiment. His judgment was, no doubt, clouded by the pressure of work which his own mismanagement of the business of the Session had cast on him. He had got into the state of mind in which he could think of nothing but saving the credit of the Ministry, and despatching all the troublesome people at Westminster to take their holidays. Any sensible Minister, who could have looked at things from the outside, might have known that the Merchant Shipping Bill was a far more important measure than the Agricultural Holdings Bill. But the Agricultural Holdings Bill is in a great measure Mr. DISRAELI'S OWN Bill, while the Merchant Shipping Bill is only Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY'S Bill. Mr. DISRAELI often addresses farmers on agricultural questions, but he does not pretend to know anything about merchant shipping. Without stopping to weigh their relative importance, he chose the Bill in which he felt most interest, and in the discussion of which he could take most part. This was an error, and a serious one; but it must be owned that there was something accidental in the suddenness and completeness with which the seriousness of his mistake was brought home to him. The public interest in the abandoned measure was changed from a general to a personal one by the touching scene in which the greatness of his sorrow was seen to have overpowered the reason of Mr. PLIMSOLL. The thought of the horrible fate to which the inactivity of the Government might be consigning hundreds of seamen was impressed by a dramatic incident on the mind of the nation. Sympathy with Mr. PLIMSOLL swept over the feelings of Conservatives and Liberals alike. And, as it chanced, at the exact moment when the public was beginning to get warm, the story was published of an Irish trial in which a conviction had been obtained against a shipowner who had attempted to send a rotten ship to sea on the assurance of his correspondents that at the port of departure there was "no danger of PLIMSOLL." Danger from the Board of Trade did not seem to affect the minds of the contrivers of this villany, although in point of fact the ship was detained by the Board of Trade, and the prosecution instituted under its directions. It was Mr. PLIMSOLL alone of whom they were originally afraid; and Mr. PLIMSOLL had just been driven to madness by the Government refusing to assist him in his great enterprise. The story seemed more convincing than volumes of statistics or hours of argument. A state of feeling was thus produced which bore with irresistible power on the Ministry. They saw their mistake, they confessed it, and they did their best to repair it. They performed, without delay and without an affectation of having been right where they

knew they had been wrong, a conspicuous act of penitence. They decided to bring in a new Bill giving them for a year very large powers of stopping unseaworthy vessels. There is no use in triumphing over them for this, or in trying to make them feel very humble. When public men have owned to having made a mistake, and have done their best to remedy it, there is no more to be said, unless some one else is to take their place and do their work for them. Mr. GOSCHEN might have spared himself the pleasure of stating that the new measure ought to have been announced when the Merchant Shipping Bill was abandoned, and Lord RUSSELL might have refrained from giving his idle notice of moving for an address to defer the prorogation of Parliament until a measure for the protection of seamen had been passed. These are but the little kicks which not very generous persons give to those who are down.

The Bill which the Government has brought in to repair its mistake, and in order to meet the sudden call for a Protection Act by which it was beset, is a very sweeping measure. It gives the agents of the Government immense powers—powers so large that the only excuse for conferring them, with the limited discussion now possible, is that they are temporary. The Board of Trade may appoint under its provisions any number of agents in any port it pleases, and every one of these agents may in his own discretion stop any ship from sailing, for any cause which he thinks likely to endanger the lives of those on board. It is not merely because the ship is old or rotten or is not classed in a particular way that he can stop her sailing. If he thinks that she is overloaded, or that her loading is not proper, he can detain her. There is to be an unspecified number of unspecified persons each of whom can say to the owner of any ship that she is not to sail. Further, if one-fourth of the crew of any vessel, or any four seamen of a crew less than twenty, declare that the ship for which they are engaged is not fit to sail, then the officer to whom they make the statement is, without requiring them to give any security for costs, to ascertain whether the ship ought to be detained. A very limited portion of a crew can therefore make an officer act; and even if the ship is fit for sea, there must be considerable delay before this can be ascertained, and the complainants lose nothing by having complained, although on insufficient grounds. It will of course make a very great difference whether the Board of Trade goes to work so as to put the Act in force or not. It can appoint many agents or few agents; it can make it understood that there is to be zeal, or is not to be zeal, in the discharge of their functions by its officials. It can turn a willing or a deaf ear to the remonstrances of shipowners. But Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY gave the House a positive assurance that he fully intended to work the Act, if it was carried, so that it should fulfil its one purpose of protecting the lives of seamen. He really put himself into the position of offering that, if sufficient powers are given him, no ship shall for a year's time be sent to sea which is not fit to go. He is invested with a dictatorship on the condition that he guarantees the lives of seamen against risk. He will have a very busy and anxious time before him, but he is prepared for it. This is a very great responsibility for a Minister to take, but Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY, in response to the feelings of an excited nation, is prepared to take it. It is curious to think that last week, under the arrangements of his chief, he was prepared to pass the winter in regretting, politely and comfortably,

that he could practically do next to nothing in cases of emergency.

Mr. PLIMSOLL read on Thursday night the terms of the apology he was bound to make for the violence of language into which he had been betrayed in the moment of his great disappointment. The House of course accepted this apology, and Mr. DISRAELI stated that, had he known at the time the whole circumstances, and been aware that Mr. PLIMSOLL was physically incapable of controlling himself, he would not have thought it necessary to ask the House to notice what Mr. PLIMSOLL said. In making his apology, Mr. PLIMSOLL said that he did not withdraw any statement of fact; and this might have seemed to an assembly disposed to be hostile and critical as equivalent to repeating the charge against members of the House that they knowingly sent unseaworthy ships to sea, although he would not say that they were villains for doing so. But the House was not in a humour to quarrel with Mr. PLIMSOLL, and it had too much practical sense to spend precious hours at the close of the Session in inquiring what he meant precisely by the statements of fact which he did not withdraw. It was subsequently announced that Mr. PLIMSOLL wished to withdraw his own Bill in order to help forward the new Government measure, leaving to Mr. REED to propose the insertion of clauses embodying the chief points of Mr. PLIMSOLL's Bill. What Mr. PLIMSOLL and those acting with him ask is that it should be enacted that no British ship shall proceed to sea without a certificate that she is in a fit condition to go, or with a deck cargo not sanctioned by the Board of Trade, or with a grain cargo stowed in bulk, or without a load line marked on her. Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY says that all provisions of this kind are inconsistent with the principle which the Government maintains is the right one, that owners are to take all the risk of sending ships improperly to sea, and that to cover them by a Government certificate beforehand would be to defeat this object. On this, however, there are two observations to be made. In the first place, Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY himself says that when a rascally owner sends his ship to sea, has the satisfaction of hearing that she has been lost with all hands, and receives more than the value of ship and cargo from insurers, he has got all that he wanted, and is perfectly safe. There is no one to give evidence against him. The Government plan fails in the very cases where its operation is most needed. In the next place, those despotic agents whom the Government is going to create must virtually do the very things which Mr. PLIMSOLL wishes to see done. They must detain every ship as to which they are not sure that she is in a fit state to go to sea, or which is improperly loaded. Otherwise owners will succeed in sending unfit ships to sea, and this is what Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY undertakes to prevent. Either Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY's officials will be negligent, or they will do what he objects to doing. That a ship is not detained will be equivalent to her receiving the certificate which Mr. PLIMSOLL suggests shall be required. Prosecutions are not to be relied upon, and are not really relied upon, either by the Government or by Mr. PLIMSOLL. The Board of Trade has only prosecuted in two cases, and in both cases the ship was detained before going to sea. It is by detention, not by subsequent prosecutions, that the Government proposes to save the lives of sailors. All that Mr. PLIMSOLL asks is that the rules of detention shall be laid down so as to ensure the vigilant action of the officials. Sir CHARLES ADDERLEY prefers that the officials shall act on these rules without their being laid down. There may be a difference in point of expediency between the two methods; but it is difficult to see that there is any difference of policy.

THE LABOUR LAWS.

THE Government has, through the LORD CHANCELLOR, proposed another, and perhaps a final, version of the difficult clause which has been so elaborately discussed during the debates on the Conspiracy Bill. It may be assumed that a task which Lord CAIRNS has but imperfectly accomplished is intrinsically difficult. Mr. CROSS, with the assistance of Mr. LOWE, produced a clause which satisfied few critics, although the House of Commons, in sheer weariness, allowed it to pass. The new edition is perhaps clearer, but it ought to have been framed so as to avoid the vague and unscientific phrase of "seriously annoying,"

and it will dissatisfy the Trade-Unions by increasing the stringency of the law against picketing, unless the final proviso operates as a repeal of the clause. It will be an offence to persistently follow any person about from place to place with a view to compulsion; or, for the same purpose, either to watch or beset the house where the person to be coerced resides or works, or to follow such person with one or more other persons in a disorderly manner in or through any street or road. It is, however, provided that attendance at or near the house where a person works in order merely to obtain or communicate information, and not with a view to intimidate or to deter by serious annoyance such person from doing what he has a right to do, shall not be deemed watching or besetting. The puzzle which has been sometimes proposed to justices and to Courts under Lord ELCHO's Act is not rendered simpler by the new project of legislation. Workmen on strike will incur penal consequences if they watch or beset a workshop; but they may contend that, according to the proviso, watching is not watching, nor besetting besetting. Fortunately, the enactment against persistently following a victim from place to place is not explained away at the end of the clause. A more cumbersome and more awkward clause has never been framed; but the task of protecting the objects of annoyance without interfering with the free action of their persecutors is perhaps unattainable. It may be doubted whether a trade picket has ever been set for the purpose of giving or receiving information. Workmen on strike and their successors know all that they are supposed to learn or to communicate, including the fact that those who take up abandoned work incur the enmity of those whom they supersede. The abortive efforts of Mr. CROSS, Mr. LOWE, and the LORD CHANCELLOR illustrate the impossibility of legislating on one theory for the purpose of satisfying the votaries of an opposite and inconsistent doctrine. The Government wishes to give perfect liberty to do anything short of persecution, while the Unions care little for anything but the right to persecute.

The necessity of some provision against breaches of contract which tend to injure valuable property was illustrated by an instance quoted by Lord WINMARLEIGH. Three workmen left a blast furnace when the iron was in a liquid state, with the result of rendering the construction of a new furnace necessary at a cost of 2,000*l.* It may be taken for granted that the workmen understood the injury which they caused to their employer, and that they calculated on the mischief as a security for the concession of their demands. If the ironmaster had broken his contract with the workmen, they could easily have obtained adequate damages; when they inflicted on their employer a ruinous injury, they only incurred the risk of paying him the infinitesimal compensation which they could afford. The LORD CHANCELLOR properly scouted the proposal that Gas and Water Companies or Corporations should be criminally punishable for a failure of supply. As Judges used formerly to say with reference to certain decisions, it is sometimes necessary to exercise common sense. If stokers conspire to cause grave injury to an offending community, they ought to be punished. Gas Companies and Corporations might be equally culpable if they committed similar acts; but it is certain that they will do nothing of the kind, because their interests are not likely to be overpowered by malevolent passions. Although the law of conspiracy in regard to trade offences will be practically repealed, evidence of previous concert will be admissible as proof of the intentional character of the breach of contract. The absence of a single gas-stoker from his post might be attributed to many causes or motives. If all the stokers in a district simultaneously leave work without notice, it may be taken for granted that all of them designed to deprive the district of light. The agitators will not be contented with the new law; but Parliament, after endeavouring for a great part of a Session to redress their grievances, will be in a better position for the refusal of excessive demands. With the exception of Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, no speaker in either House has defended the worst forms of trade oppression.

The LORD CHANCELLOR conformed to a questionable fashion in beginning his statement with a reference to the one-sided legislation of forgotten times. It may be admitted once for all that in the days of the PLANTAGENETS and the TUDORS, the ruling classes appreciated but imperfectly the rights of their poorer countrymen. Selfishness was not unknown before political economy and legal

equality were fully understood. As Lord CAIRNS states, when the pestilence known as the Black Death had destroyed in two or three years a third of the inhabitants of England, the landowners who were then the only employers attempted by arbitrary legislation to correct the influence of depopulation on the labour market. Parliament passed Acts for compelling workmen to serve at the same wages as before the plague, although the value of labour was of course largely enhanced. The wrong which may have been inflicted and suffered five hundred years ago is no argument for wrongful legislation in the opposite direction. It is true that the proposals of the Government are essentially equitable; but capitalists will not be reassured by the adoption of the favourite arguments of agitators. The employers have shown good sense and self-control in abstaining from any attempt to defeat the Government Bill. It would be a mistake to assume that they are satisfied; and it is to be regretted that they were, as Lord WINMARLEIGH remarked, not represented on the Commission. The more thoughtful manufacturers have probably long since made up their minds to rely in dealings with their workmen on good feeling and judicious management rather than on legal penalties. At the best it is impossible to guard against the caprices of workmen and the officious dictation of Trade Councils; but the time has long since past when a strike could be prevented by legal proceedings, and discussions with workmen, like diplomatic negotiations, have always war in the background. The prosecutions under the existing law have been few in number, though they have caused the agitation which has resulted in the introduction of Mr. CROSS's Bill. It is not improbable that the enactment which expresses the combined ingenuity of Mr. CROSS, Mr. LOWE, and the LORD CHANCELLOR, may need judicial interpretation before its meaning is generally understood.

In the Bills which have now virtually received the assent of both Houses the removal of a sentimental grievance has been as far as possible effected. The leaders and advisers of the Trade-Unions demanded that acts exclusively performed by a single class should be regulated only by general law. If landlords or manufacturers were in the habit of intimidating or injuring their dependents by any particular misuse of their powers, the evil would probably be abated by special legislation, nor would Parliament take precautions against ejections on the part of occupiers or lock-outs contrived by workmen. In the new Act workmen are as far as possible disguised under the general name of persons, and it is only when an exception to the ordinary law is to be provided in their favour that they are exclusively relieved from the penalties of conspiracy. The LORD CHANCELLOR expressed regret for his inability to deal with the general law of conspiracy, instead of conceding exceptional impunity to combinations of workmen; but, in declaring with good reason that the task was impracticable, he in some degree answered himself. What cannot be effected by a change in the law is not a desirable object of legislation. Conspiracy, though it is the vaguest branch of criminal law, naturally constitutes a separate and substantial offence. The only excuse for exempting workmen from the penalties of conspiracy is that they always act in bodies, and that all their proceedings are consequently gregarious. The rest of mankind either commit offences singly, or deliberately join themselves with selected accomplices. The member of a Trade-Union, having no independent action of his own, necessarily becomes a conspirator as soon as he is party to an irregular proceeding. Early legislators held the members of guilds and other associations jointly responsible for offences committed by their associates or by the corporate body. It is now thought advisable to isolate in responsibility the parties to a combined action. The Government measure is in this and other respects defensible, but, as it involves liberal concessions to a powerful class, the motives of its promoters will naturally be subject to criticism.

THE MEETING OF THE MAYORS.

THE great meeting of Mayors is an event of considerable importance to the City authorities, and not without interest to the world outside. The main thing for a Lord Mayor is to think of somebody to entertain who is out of the common way, and the notion of asking the Mayors of other countries to meet the Mayors of the

United Kingdom, if obvious, is still novel. A Mayor of any country must wish to see the biggest Mayor in the world, and the Lord Mayor is indisputably at the head of his profession. The Prefect of the Seine has more to do, and more authority, and is appointed with a stricter regard to aptitude for his duties. But he is hardly so much a Mayor as a great Government official, and the Hôtel de Ville is in ashes, while the Guildhall exists with all its historical associations. We may also now venture to ask foreign Mayors to look at London. It is a city worth seeing, even apart from the splendour of the entertainments with which the guests of the LORD MAYOR will be welcomed. Foreigners have always had it open to them to admire the gathering of shipping below London Bridge, and to wonder at the unending masses of ugly or frail houses which stretch for miles in every direction in order to accommodate in a single town a population greater than that of Scotland. But the last twenty years have given them other things to see in London. No city has a finer prospect than that which is now to be seen from the centre of Westminster Bridge, and no city has open spaces in it comparable to Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens. The Mayors, too, who come from abroad may have the satisfaction, if they can but understand what is meant by it, of knowing that they have come at the right time. Mayors have, in fact, gone up in the world of English opinion. If the foreign Mayors had come some years ago, they might have perceived that Mayors were not very much thought of here. They were the objects of a little gentle ridicule, and were popularly supposed to be absorbed in eating turtle. Now Mayors are generally allowed to be very respectable. The corruptions and abuses of the old Corporations have died out or been swept away; increased locomotion brings to Mayors guests whom it is for the honour of the town that they should entertain respectably; and bettermen are willing to be better Mayors. It has been truly remarked that, if intelligent foreigners wish to see a good specimen of the ordinary business-like, practical, open-handed, more or less educated Englishman, with independence and love of justice, and delight in the honest importance of office, they get such a specimen in the Lord Mayor of London, and could not have a better. Nor will the intelligent foreigner fail to observe with interest the commendably high style in which such matters as a gathering of Mayors are treated in England. In one journal he will observe that Mayors are reminded that, although great, they are mortal; that a certain eye is upon them, and that they must be continually working hard to do better and better, or they and their Corporations will have something very terrible happen to them. Another journal casts on Mayors the burden of immemorial dignity, and bids them remember that they are the lineal successors of ancient persons who used to perform their functions inside a quickset hedge, with a real elective Vestry and an elective beadle to help them. All this is merely ancillary to the service which on Sunday they are to have the means of attending at St. Paul's. Altogether it will be disappointing and undeserved if the foreign Mayors do not carry away the impression that, for eating and preaching, London is without a rival.

The Burgomaster of BRUSSELS truly remarked that there was no Mayor except the Lord Mayor of London whom so many other Mayors would have taken the trouble to visit. There is something about the Lord Mayor that is unique. The PREFECT of the SEINE lately entertained him as he is now entertaining the PREFECT of the SEINE. Each can give magnificent entertainments, and each on his own soil may think he is as great a man as the other. But outside Mayors feel that the Lord Mayor is beyond all question a Mayor, while as to the Prefect of the Seine they are in doubt. From many quarters Mayors are willing to go to London. There was the Mayor of QUEBEC to represent the Western hemisphere, and there was the Syndic of ROME, whom the LORD MAYOR eloquently noticed as "the representative of a European city famed in classic lore as well as in more modern times." The Mayor of QUEBEC was able to assure his hearers that the welcome he had received would have an excellent effect in strengthening the ties that bind the Dominion to the mother-country; and the Syndic of ROME expressed an earnest hope that the meeting of the Mayors would materially serve the sacred cause of liberty and civilization. In a more practical spirit the Mayor of PHILADELPHIA telegraphed to say that, although he could not exactly come to London for a dinner, yet he hoped all present would come next year

to the American Exhibition. But besides foreign Mayors there were numerous home Mayors, and it is satisfactory to think that national jealousy does not in respect of such gatherings stand in the way of cordiality, and that the Lord Mayor of DUBLIN and the Lord Provost of EDINBURGH recognize their superior and their friend in the Lord Mayor of LONDON. There can be no doubt that meetings such as this of the Mayors of all countries do real good. They foster a kindly feeling between men of influence in different nations. They make England better known and better liked. They serve as a demonstration in favour of a policy of peace; and although the great military monarchies, when bent on war, do not trouble themselves much about the feelings of Mayors, yet all expressions of respectable opinion tell somehow and in the long run. Although dinners and speeches and exhibitions have not prevented war during the last quarter of a century, they and the things of which they are a symbol have made the intercourse between nations more pleasant, frank, and sincere. The French AMBASSADOR took the opportunity of having to make a speech to acknowledge in a graceful way the assistance which England has on more than one recent occasion bestowed on suffering France. It was right that, dining at the LORD MAYOR's table, he should do so. It is to the Lord Mayor, as a person at once in a conspicuous position and unconnected with the Government, that England looks to start subscriptions in cases of great domestic or foreign calamity; and the occasion was a fitting one for the representative of France to acknowledge that, as regards his country, this function of the Mayoralty had been readily and ably discharged.

Mayors are naturally delighted with their office, and see it on its best side. A Mayor may be fairly taken as the representative of municipal government, and the experience of many countries has justified the Burgomaster of BRUSSELS in remarking that municipal liberty and political liberty generally go together. The world, however, does not move in a single path, and the value of Mayors as the representatives of municipal liberty is not everywhere acknowledged. The PREFECT of the SEINE, while enjoying his dinner, must have reflected that in his country Mayors are Government nominees, whose business it is to clog the action and restrain the ambition of those who enjoy the minute degree of municipal liberty permitted in France. It is also to be observed that no representative from any German town appears to have visited the LORD MAYOR, and prudence may have suggested to those who would have liked to come that to stay at home and hold their tongues was the safest course as things now are in Germany. It was the minor nations, the nations that love to copy England and look to England in some vague way for protection—Sweden, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Portugal—that sent their Mayors to the Guildhall. Such nations are right in judging that they cannot import English political freedom merely by creating a Chamber of Deputies. There must be life and common action and freedom in the little things of municipalities in order that there may be life and common action and freedom in the great things of a nation. And in countries where there is real political life, there is also a constant tendency to increase the sphere of municipal powers and duties. Municipal authorities have now two new responsibilities thrown on them, the construction of public works for the purposes of health or convenience, and the furtherance of public education. These are great things, and call out the energies of those to whom the conduct of them is entrusted. To do them well needs all the qualities which should accompany the exercise of great power; and the gain to the community when they are well done consists not only in the excellence of the work achieved, but also in the development of activity and energy which makes the achievement of good work possible. That the LORD MAYOR and the Corporation of London do their work well enough to offer a good example is among the qualifications which have justified them in asking the representatives of foreign municipalities to come to see them and London.

BISHOP THIRLWALL.

THE death of the greatest English master of ancient and modern learning would deserve notice even if Bishop THIRLWALL had not been also the most statesmanlike ecclesiastic of his time. Although his life was spent in the accumulation of vast stores of knowledge, no man could

have less of the character of a pedantic bookworm. The effect of his tastes and habits was shown in a want of social facility; but he always kept his mind open to the acquisition of political and practical information. A few German Professors may have known as much of Greek, of history, and of comparative philology; but they would scarcely have appreciated Bishop THIRLWALL's interest in current literature, and his perfect familiarity with all the controversies of the day. His comprehensive curiosity would perhaps, even if he had not been professionally concerned with theology, have embraced the ecclesiastical studies which might have seemed uncongenial to his intellect. He read modern history and biography as well as the most recondite treatises on Sanskrit literature or on hieroglyphics, and his travelling library, when he enjoyed what he declared to be the greatest of pleasures, that of reading in an open carriage, generally comprised a selection of English and French novels. Indifferent to fame as an author, he was far more inclined to learn than to teach, and after the completion, many years ago, of his *History of Greece*, he published little except his celebrated episcopal Charges. Readers of the *Life of GROTE* will remember the generous letter in which Bishop THIRLWALL congratulated his early friend and schoolfellow on a work which he expected to supersede his own. His chivalrous acknowledgment of an assumed superiority which he might have fairly disputed probably cost him little effort. THIRLWALL had too great a mind to be capable of personal jealousy, and he may have cared more for the production of the best *History of Greece* than for any credit he might derive from his work. Of the two *Histories* THIRLWALL's was the more dispassionate, because he stood apart from modern politics, which have since the time of MITFORD been inseparably connected with controversies on Athenian democracy.

The time at which THIRLWALL took orders was probably determined by the approach of the term at which his Trinity fellowship would have become untenable by a layman. A year or two earlier he had been called to the Bar; and in some respects his legal studies were not unattractive to his acute and logical intellect. In after life he retained a pleasant recollection of the abstruse niceties of FEARNE's *Contingent Remainders*. If he had persevered he would have been one of the profoundest of lawyers, and in course of time an incomparable judge; but he had neither the gifts nor the temperament of an advocate, and the practice of the profession was repugnant to his taste. He is reported to have said that the blessings which, according to LORD COKE, are bestowed by Providence on great lawyers were no more than an equivalent for the wretchedness of their lives here and their prospects hereafter. Before he left the Bar he had prepared, as a contribution to theological literature, a translation of a German treatise, with a preface of his own, which may well have startled the orthodoxy of fifty years ago. For several years after his return to Cambridge he discharged with assiduity and success the congenial duties of a classical teacher, while he constantly added to his own accumulations of learning. He was known as the first scholar in the University, and though he was reserved in his manner, he was popular with his pupils and his equals. His career was interrupted by dismissal from the office of Assistant Tutor by the Head of his College, who was one of the vainest and most bigoted of men. The offence of the great scholar consisted in the publication of an admirable pamphlet in favour of the admission of Dissenters to the University. It fortunately happened that the Whig Ministers of the time took up his cause as a party question. LORD MELBOURNE presented him to a living in Yorkshire, and, after a short interval, he promoted him to the Bishopric of St. David's. When he resigned his see in 1874, he was the oldest Bishop on the Bench both in years and in date of consecration.

It would not have been difficult to imagine other employments for which he would have been better suited, but for the rest of his life he devoted himself conscientiously to the discharge of his duty, as he understood it. It had not then become the fashion for bishops to busy themselves incessantly with petty details and minute correspondence, which, amongst other disadvantages, renders it almost impossible that they should either think or read. The greater part of Bishop THIRLWALL's time was occupied with his studies, but he attended to the business of his office, and he contributed with untiring munificence to the numerous necessities of a poor diocese. His principal defect was in the social tact and popular manner which are among the

most indispensable qualities of lay and clerical dignitaries. In the vast diocese of St. David's, which extends from the English border to the Irish Sea, the Church had in past ages been hopelessly plundered, first by monastic institutions and afterwards by Reformers. The natural consequence has been a scarcity of learning and an occasional absence of refinement among the clergy. A genial temper and an affable address would have been more acceptable to the BISHOP's subordinates than all the learning and wisdom, in which nevertheless they took a laudable pride. It seldom happens that want of aptitude for the administration of small things is recognized as a claim to the government of many cities, but the BISHOP who neither felt nor gave perfect satisfaction in a remote Welsh diocese would probably have been an admirable Primate of all England. The moderation which is justly regarded as the most necessary qualification of an Archbishop of Canterbury would have been more fully secured by Dr. THIRLWALL's large and dispassionate understanding than by the most exemplary preference of commonplace to eccentricity. In the conduct of difficult controversies he would have guided his colleagues and the clergy with an authority and a provident sagacity which have seldom been found in England. The most unfriendly observer would never have accused him of insincerity or of a wish to court popularity, and yet he would have instinctively abstained from collision with the prejudices and feelings of the community. The Charges, which, with the *History of Greece*, will preserve his memory, are the weightiest of all the judgments which have been pronounced on the ecclesiastical questions of the time; but the most conspicuous illustration of Bishop THIRLWALL's superiority over contemporary prelates was to be found in his great speech on the disestablishment of the Irish Church. No speaker on the question, in either House of Parliament, defended the measure by arguments so convincing and so exhaustive. The Bishops of the present day are, with some notorious exceptions, above the average of men in ability; and the most judicious members of the body knew that the result which they naturally regretted had become inevitable; but Bishop THIRLWALL was the only Bishop who had the courage and foresight to speak and vote for the Bill. The argument in its favour which he deduced from his rooted antipathy to the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church probably overcame many adverse prepossessions. Bishop THIRLWALL had little of the personal knowledge of human nature which is necessary for the successful management of ordinary affairs; but when the choice of a course of conduct was to be determined by broad principles and by a comprehensive judgment of expediency, he rose from a prelate to a statesman. It is a misfortune that, instead of directing the fortunes of the English Church, he should have been worried with little troubles about parish schools and churchwardens which would have been better managed by a far inferior man.

The merit of Bishop THIRLWALL's speeches consisted wholly in force of reasoning and in justice of conclusion. He was entirely wanting in the prompt enthusiasm and graceful fluency of his friend and colleague, the late Bishop of WINCHESTER; and, in truth, he was a prolix and tiresome speaker and a tedious preacher. It was difficult to anticipate at the beginning of a cumbersome sentence the grammatical construction which nevertheless was ultimately found to be conscientiously accurate. His episodes and digressions seemed interminable, though the practised hearer felt a well-founded confidence that they would ultimately come round to the material issue. The same want of the art of selection and concentration might be observed in the BISHOP's sermons; and the effect of his pulpit delivery was impaired by a tremulous earnestness of voice which contrasted oddly with the unimpassioned matter of his discourse. The same trick or mannerism was common to many of his Cambridge friends; but it was better suited to Archdeacon HARE's facile and rhetorical excitement, or to the perennial emotion of Mr. MAURICE. The ironical humour which characterized Bishop THIRLWALL's conversation and some passages in his writings would perhaps, if it had been frequently introduced in the pulpit, have offended the squeamish taste of a modern congregation. He once observed in a sermon delivered in a London church, in answer to Dr. NEWMAN, who had contrasted the piety of Italian Lazzaroni with the hardened carelessness of English workmen, that he could not agree with an eminent person that dirt,

idleness, and dishonesty were in themselves conclusive proofs of moral and religious excellence, or obvious indications of Divine favour. In social intercourse the BISHOP neither sought nor attained general popularity. He keenly enjoyed the conversation of scholars, and even of men of the world who approached to his own intellectual level; but he had neither faculty nor disposition for conventional talk, and he took no trouble to put dull or uninteresting companions at their ease. His measured phrases were well suited to point his not unfrequent sarcasms. His laugh, though it was ready, seemed artificial and constrained, and, as Mr. ROGERS long ago observed, it subsided with unexpected suddenness into the deepest gravity. His death at a somewhat advanced age is the less to be regretted because his affliction of blindness had incapacitated him for the studies which were the occupation and enjoyment of his life. His career was so far happy that it enabled him worthily to employ extraordinary intellectual powers.

FRANCE.

THE majority of the 15th of July is now a fortnight old, and French politicians must soon begin to look about them for the materials of some new party combination. M. BUFFET reverses the rule, always to treat an enemy as though he may some day be a friend; his principal anxiety seems to be so to behave himself to his friends as to warn them that they will not be his friends always. The nearness of the vacation will probably postpone the next occasion of impressing this lesson on the Right. The Left will remain in opposition during the recess, and the Assembly will meet again with the Government still depending on the support of the Conservatives. How long this position of affairs will remain unchanged must depend on the drift of those meditations to which M. DUBAURE referred in his speech last week. If the Government have in the interval reconciled themselves to the idea of a dissolution, the majority of the 25th of February will be reconstituted, and short as the available time will be, the elections may somehow be got over before the New Year. If, on the other hand, the Government are still unwilling to exchange the ills they know for the worse ills that may conceivably remain behind, they will renew their appeal to the Right, and no doubt be again successful in staving off the day they so much fear. There are really no data in existence from which to determine which of these two courses Ministers are most likely to take. There is no reason to doubt that M. DUBAURE and M. LÉON SAY are honestly anxious to set the Republican Constitution going, but their position is one in which opposite notions of the course they are bound to take may fairly be entertained. There is no question about the propriety of a prompt dissolution, nor is it probable that M. DUBAURE or M. LÉON SAY has any hesitation about the propriety of urging this policy upon his colleagues. It is when the moment arrives at which a Minister ordinarily backs his opinion by the threat of resignation that the Republican members of M. BUFFET's Cabinet may feel a legitimate uncertainty as to the course which they ought to take. If, rather than lose their services, M. BUFFET would yield to their wishes, it is plain that no considerations of courtesy or etiquette ought to prevent them from acting decisively. Though it can never be pleasant to force your views upon a colleague by making your continued working with him depend upon his adoption of them, it may under given circumstances be a plain duty to do so. But M. DUBAURE and M. LÉON SAY are not in this position. If they were to retire from the Cabinet at this moment, it is far from certain that M. BUFFET would not be exceedingly pleased to get rid of them. He would then be able to plead that he had done everything in his power to conciliate the Republican party, and that if he now went back to the Right, it was because the Republicans wished to force him into a policy of reckless violence. In the present balance of parties in the Assembly, the chances are that a Minister making this appeal and commanding, as M. BUFFET undoubtedly would command, the confidence of the PRESIDENT, would find a majority ready to support him. There would be no difficulty in filling the places of the retiring Ministers. If the Duke of BROGLIE did not himself take office, he would be ready to find substitutes. The apparent imminence of the dissolution seems thoroughly to have frightened the Right, and they would probably be pre-

pared to support the Cabinet on no harder conditions than that it continued to govern with the existing Assembly, and made no more attempts to gain the confidence of the Left. In this way the majority of the 15th of July would become more and more like the majority of the 24th of May, and all the constitutional work which has been got through since the Duke of BROGLIE's overthrow would run the greatest possible risk of being, if not formally undone, at least allowed to remain altogether inoperative.

This is a prospect which may very well make the Republican section of the Cabinet uneasy. On the other hand, so long as M. BUFFET does not demand of them anything inconsistent with the conditions on which they took office, their presence in the Ministry is a kind of guarantee to the Left that no underhand manoeuvres against Republican institutions will be practised by the subordinates of the Government, and that the dissolution will not be put off merely in the hope of some happy accident upsetting the existing order of things. It was to those members of the Left who are still willing to accept this guarantee that M. DUFAURE's speech was perhaps addressed. M. DUFAURE is not much given to appeals *ad misericordiam*, and even a plea for forbearance becomes in his mouth a little dictatorial. But what he says comes in effect to this—Wait till November, and then I promise you there shall be no more concealments. It will then be the duty of the Ministers to lay before you the result of their labours and reflections, and you know enough of me to feel sure that, as far as I am concerned, that duty will be done. If there are any good reasons for delaying the elections, or any reasons which seem good to us, we will honestly tell you what those reasons are. You shall be made partakers of our apprehensions, our fears, our scruples, our ideas. If we think the elections can be held immediately, we shall not wait to have a dissolution forced upon us; we shall meet you with all our preparations made, and you will at once be called on to discuss Bills fixing the dates for the several elections which must precede the meeting of the new Legislature.

Whether the Republican section of the Cabinet are wise in taking this line is a point on which it is impossible to pronounce an opinion without knowing the secret history of the last few weeks. It is obvious, however, that M. BUFFET has of late assumed a very independent position as regards the Left, and he would scarcely have done this unless he had felt sure of being supported in case of need by the full strength of the Right. It is not likely that M. BUFFET wishes to trust himself entirely to his new supporters; but the retirement of the Liberal members of his Cabinet would leave him no choice, and it is at least conceivable that M. DUFAURE and M. SAY may be right in thinking that it is better to make almost any concession than to risk a reconstruction of the old compact union of the Right and the Right Centre. There can be no doubt unfortunately as to the injury to France which is likely to result from a state of affairs which necessitates such an amount of forbearance on the part of the Republican Ministers. Nothing can so much help on the designs of the Bonapartists as the prolongation of the present political uncertainty. The postponement of the dissolution not only shows the unwillingness of the party now in power to accept the Constitution which they consented to vote; it also shows—and this is a more serious symptom—their belief that the country does not care very much whether they accept it or not. Of course the opinion of the Conservatives in the Assembly may not be a trustworthy index to the feeling of the constituencies. But the Government, at all events, have the means of forming a very shrewd guess as to the amount of indifference on which they can reckon, and M. BUFFET would hardly pursue his present policy if he thought it likely to be fatal to him in the elections. This indifference, if it exists, is mainly the work of the Duke of BROGLIE and his successors; but it will not benefit those who are responsible for its creation. It is true that the Republic is not likely to be founded by men who have no preference for one form of Government over another; but the Orleanist Monarchy is just as little fitted to secure their affections. Frenchmen who care nothing about politics are almost certain to drift into Imperialism. We do not know enough of the temper of the constituencies to say positively whether the hatred of the Empire which undoubtedly animates the Assembly is likely to be reproduced in the Chamber of Deputies, but it is safe to say that no evidence is forthcoming in favour of this view, and that it is almost certain to become less and less true with every month that the dissolution is deferred. The establishment

of a Republic which should be hostile neither to property nor to religion must at first have appeared to great numbers of Frenchmen a fact too improbable for belief, and when each week discloses some new obstacle to its accomplishment, they will naturally drift back into their old scepticism. Besides, there is a constant danger that the forbearance of the Republicans, which has done so much to reassure timid converts to Republican ideas, may suddenly give way, and that a violent speech from M. GAMBETTA, or an open schism between M. GAMBETTA and his party, may convince the moderate party in the country that their only chance of escaping anarchy on the one hand and a reactionary kingship on the other is to make the best of the Empire. The suppression of the partial elections is from this point of view a great gain to the Bonapartists. If these dropping contests were still going on, the Bonapartists would be forced to contest seats wherever they had a chance of winning them, lest the omission to do so should depress the enthusiasm of their supporters. Yet nothing could do them so much harm while the Assembly is still in being as an electoral triumph which would reproduce the alarm excited by their victory in the Nièvre, and again throw all the waverers in the Assembly into the arms of the Republicans.

THE DEBATE ON INCLOSURES.

THE House of Commons has once more determined to adjourn indefinitely the extension of inclosures. Two propositions, which are habitually affirmed by theoretical philanthropists, lead to inconsistent conclusions. When landowners claim the right of dealing with their private property, they are informed that the production of the food of the people is a matter of public concern. Their proposals to increase the food of the people by enclosing the land which belongs to lords of the manor, subject to the rights of commoners, are met by the contention that the community is interested in the preservation of open spaces. There is no doubt that it is highly desirable to preserve commons in the neighbourhood of large towns; and the benefit may almost always be secured by an equitable purchase of the soil and of the common rights. In other districts large tracts of land are rendered comparatively worthless by the refusal of Parliament to sanction inclosures. The provision of recreation grounds for a scanty pastoral population is one of the absurdest objects which could be contemplated by Parliament. The last thing which would occur to a Welsh labourer would be to take a walk for amusement over the neighbouring mountain. Shepherds frequent the hills as a matter of business to protect the flocks of their employers, or to drive off sheep belonging to a neighbouring commoner, in spite of his equal right. Hundreds of thousands of acres in hill districts are devoted exclusively to pasture, which is carried on under the greatest possible disadvantage. An inclosure would enable the same persons to pursue the same business with greater profit and convenience, and with large increase of that part of the food of the people which consists of mutton. On the lower slopes of the hills drainage and irrigation would be sometimes practicable, and oats and turnips might be grown. With the exception of tourists and of a few residents of the higher class who have a taste for riding or walking, no stranger has any motive for objection to a division of the land among its actual owners; but Mr. FAWCETT has resolved that inclosures shall cease, and successive Ministers are afraid to provoke his opposition.

The substitute which has in some parts of the country been provided for Inclosure Bills was accurately described by Mr. WALSH. The tenure of property in severalty is so much more convenient than the exercise of common rights that owners of large flocks have learned to pass little local Inclosure Bills of their own. The process consists in the employment of an adequate staff of fighting shepherds assisted by fierce dogs. The sheep of the smaller commoners are chased off large tracts of pasture, and the owners can only assert their rights at their own peril. Nature or self-interest, which in civilized communities abhors common property, asserts itself with irregular vehemence. The large flock-masters would probably greatly prefer the protection of a stone wall to the maintenance of a gang of lawless retainers; and the small commoners would receive an award of their claims under an Inclosure Bill; but Mr. FAWCETT says that there

shall be no inclosures, and Mr. FAWCETT is a philanthropic member. It is extremely fortunate that large tracts of mountain land were inclosed immediately before the time when Parliament thought fit to include remote sheepwalks in the same category with Wimbledon Common and Hampstead Heath. About thirty years ago private Inclosure Bills were discontinued, on the ground that the division of commons among their owners was obviously advantageous. The functions of the Inclosure Commissioners are simply ministerial. It is their duty to take care that the proper notices were given, and that the necessary consents were obtained. A general Act, passed as a matter of course at the end of every Session, confirmed their decisions; and the land was divided among those who were entitled to shares according to definite rules. It was an oversight not to provide a substitute for the judicial functions which had in the case of opposed Inclosure Bills been exercised by Select Committees. There were some cases in which an inclosure ought not to have been allowed, except, perhaps, on special conditions which the Commissioners had no authority to impose. The reaction which has been caused by the occurrence of a few exceptional cases is the best proof that sufficient precautions had not previously been taken. The authors of the Inclosure Commission could not have foreseen that modern theorists would found arguments for the maintenance of commons on Sir HENRY MAINE'S researches into the primeval history of the Aryan race. The doctrine that the nation or the neighbouring population has any share in the land which belongs to the lords and to the commoners is of recent origin. If the rights of cottagers have been overlooked, the remedy for the evil would be to provide them with additional securities, and not to stop all inclosures.

Mr. CROSS closed the discussion by expressing an objection to the practice which had prevailed until the House of Commons refused to pass the annual Inclosure Bill. In his opinion it was undesirable that the Government should be bound by the Reports of the Commissioners, instead of exercising a discretion of its own. A few years ago Parliament would perhaps have resented the assumption of legislative power by the Government. There seems to be no reason for making inclosures depend on the discretion of the Home Office, which has no judicial machinery for ascertaining the merits of each particular case. The House of Commons would do well to watch vigilantly the encroachments of the permanent officials who act in the name of the Secretary of State or of the Presidents of other administrative departments. The Board of Trade has on some occasions attempted to dictate to Select Committees with varying success. Mr. CROSS perhaps only intended to suggest that there should be some inquiry into the reasons for a proposed inclosure. The Commissioners might be required to report to Parliament the circumstances of each separate scheme; nor would it be difficult to distinguish between suburban commons and remote tracts of pasture. In both cases the legal rights should be exclusively recognized; but municipal bodies might be authorized to purchase open spaces either in full property or subject to rights of pasture. One consequence of the spread of education and of the improvement of taste has been the discovery that a common is, except in the close vicinity of a town, generally preferable to a park. A fair purchase often imposes little or no burden on civic funds. The reservation for building of the outskirts of a common will often enable the buyer to dedicate the remainder to public use without sensible loss. Even when no such facility exists, great towns are rich enough to provide themselves with the luxuries which they require.

The demand for a general Act which is both to facilitate and to control inclosures is not likely to be satisfied. Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN complained that land had been inclosed without regard to any rights, except those of the proprietors. It is not unnatural that the only rights which are known to the law should have been exclusively considered by Parliament and by the Commissioners. The assumption that there is also a public right attaching to private property may lead to dangerous consequences. The President of the UNITED STATES, not long since, recommended Congress to prohibit the payment by bankers of interest on deposits, on the ground that the public had an interest in the employment of capital in industrial investments. Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN is guilty of a similar economic heresy when he disputes the right of lords of the soil and of commoners to the exclusive owner-

ship of uninclosed land. The ownership of the soil and the easements belonging to the commoners are not incompatible with a liability to compulsory purchase. It is not to be assumed that the necessity of obtaining Parliamentary sanction to an improvement implies an acknowledgment of any public interest in the property concerned. An ordinary Estate Bill is promoted for the purpose of relieving limited owners from special restrictions which are disadvantageous to themselves and their successors. The consent of those who represent the interests of tenants in remainder or reversion are required; but no stranger has a right to interfere. By a manifest abuse of an accidental power, the owner for life of Hampstead Heath, was for many years prevented from obtaining relief from restrictions which were undoubtedly injurious to the estate. When his successor became absolute owner, the opponents of former Estate Bills were compelled to pay a reasonable price for the privileges which they had sought to acquire by compulsion. It would at present be almost useless to promote a private Inclosure Bill, however beneficial, because it would probably, after it had passed a Committee, be opposed and defeated in the House.

SOUTH AFRICA.

A LATE conversation in the House of Lords on the Constitution of Natal involved colonial questions of general importance. Lord CARNARVON, in common with all his recent predecessors, has cordially adopted the system of responsible government which prevails in the larger colonies. Canada and the different provinces of Australia combine material prosperity with the uncontrolled administration of their own affairs. On the other hand, Jamaica has for the first time in many years flourished since the suppression, nine or ten years ago, of an impracticable representative system. It is the business of Colonial Secretaries to distinguish between the conditions and wants of dissimilar communities, for the purpose of applying to every colony, as far as possible, the principles of government which it may require. The most conclusive reason for acquiescing in the virtual independence of the great colonies is that it has been irrevocably acquired; but a prudent statesman would, if he had absolute discretion to legislate, confirm the responsible system of government which was at first grudgingly conceded. When Lord CARNARVON had occasion to legislate for the settlements on the Gold Coast after the Ashantee war, he wisely adopted the precedent of Jamaica by vesting the government in officers appointed by the Crown. A few English traders and an anomalous aristocracy of natives who profess to be educated furnished no fit materials for constitutional government. It was necessary to secure the inhabitants of the dependency both against their own incompetence and against the possible danger of invasion from the interior. The case of Natal was more complicated, because a temperate climate has attracted genuine English settlers who have for some time enjoyed the privilege of electing the majority of a governing Legislative Council. A handful of Englishmen might perhaps have been allowed to manage their own affairs if the bulk of the population within their territories had not consisted of warlike native tribes. A local Legislature was almost certain to encroach on the rights of the Kaffirs; and in the event of retaliation it would be impossible for the Home Government to withhold protection. The inconvenience of allowing colonists to engage in wars which must be conducted by the Imperial Government was amply shown in the case of New Zealand. It is only at a distance and in perfect safety that Englishmen can regard barbarians with equanimity, and can consequently deal with them prudently and justly.

Lord BLACHFORD, whose authority on Colonial questions was fully recognized by Lord CARNARVON, inclined to the opinion that Natal ought to have been reduced to the condition of a Crown colony. The present charter, as he explained, contains a clause of revocation which would have enabled the Government to effect the change regularly and legally. The elective majority of the Legislative Council has not been fortunate in its conduct either of domestic affairs or of the relations between the colony and the natives. Lord BLACHFORD was at the Colonial Office during the disturbances in Jamaica, and he regards with reasonable apprehension the effects of a panic among the representatives of a European minority of the population. In reply Lord CARNARVON admitted that it might possibly

become necessary for the Crown to exercise its undoubted prerogative by undertaking the government of the colony. In the meantime he has obtained the consent of the Assembly to a change in the Constitution which may perhaps prove to be sufficient. Eight nominated members of Council are substituted for the same number of elected members; and, although there will still be fifteen elected members, and thirteen nominees, it seems that there is reason to hope that the majority will be reasonable and not objectionably unanimous. The elected members are required to possess a property qualification; and Lord CARNARVON relies on feelings of jealousy which are said to exist between the coast districts and the upper country. The misgovernment of the former Council has brought the financial affairs of the colony into confusion and has stopped the progress of immigration. The native tribes offer a perpetual menace as long as they are not subject to a regular system of legislation. On the whole, it seems not impossible that the necessary proportion of elected members may concur with the Government and its nominees in the legislation which is necessary for the welfare of the colony. Lord CARNARVON agrees with Lord BLACHFORD that responsible government is not suited to the present circumstances of Natal; but he holds that it is desirable, where Englishmen are concerned, to allow as much constitutional freedom as may be compatible with safety. The Legislature has, at the instance of the SECRETARY of the STATE and of Sir GARNET WOLSELEY, made considerable concessions, and Lord CARNARVON anticipates that a Legislature almost equally balanced may under proper management work well. "If unfortunately it should be found after all that the Legislature is incapable of dealing with the questions which will come before it, then, and then only, will be the time to tighten the knot, and to take greater powers than are now exercised." Local demagogues have, in accordance with the traditional practice of malcontent colonists since the days of the American Rebellion, threatened separation as the alternative of submission to the reasonable proposals of the Crown; but, as long as the native tribes remain armed on the frontier, the colony will not wantonly renounce the protection of England.

Lord CARLINGFORD objected to the policy of Lord CARNARVON in allowing the elected members a majority in the Council. He was of opinion that an elected minority would have exercised sufficient influence in domestic matters; and that it is desirable to entrust the management of native affairs to the Government and the nominated members. Lord KIMBERLEY, on the other hand, with the advantage of recent experience at the Colonial Office, considered that Lord CARNARVON's compromise was the best course that could have been adopted in the circumstances. Notwithstanding minor differences of opinion, all the speakers on the question concurred in thinking that responsible government was inapplicable to the present condition of Natal, though it may perhaps be safely conceded hereafter. There is something odd in the formal discussion of the best Constitution for a community as large as the population of a second-rate suburban parish. The sixteen thousand inhabitants of Natal are worthy of attention, not on their own account, but because they are scattered over a territory which may at some future time become a considerable State. Marylebone is many times more populous than Natal, but, as it has no possibility of expansion or of independent political existence, its Vestry is content to exercise only municipal authority.

In the course of the discussion, Lord CARNARVON noticed with approval the assent of the Government of the Cape to the release of LANGALIBALELE. Of the reception in the different South African colonies of the late despatch he had apparently no information to communicate. It is known from the reports of newspaper Correspondents that the official communication produced the customary display of indignation and bluster. A public dinner given to Mr. FROUDE, who enjoys Lord CARNARVON's confidence, was by some intrigue or mismanagement converted into an occasion for affronting the local Government. A festivity which the GOVERNOR and his Ministers declined to attend cannot have been satisfactory to the non-official agent of the Crown. The Dutch Republics are, as might be expected, eager to protest against a federation which would in some sense reduce them to dependence on the English Crown. Colonial dignity is shocked by the presumption of the English Minister in choosing the members of the proposed Congress. That his nominees would probably be the best representatives of the different pro-

vinces is of course a matter of secondary importance. Colonists are extremely touchy, and frequently unreasonable, but in the present instance the clamour appears not to be universal. The colonial newspapers express varying opinions on the policy of Lord CARNARVON, and perhaps it may ultimately be held that, in recommending the adoption of a uniform policy towards the natives, he only anticipated the convictions of all rational inhabitants of the colonies. The proposal of a federation was not an indispensable part of Lord CARNARVON's scheme, and it would perhaps be convenient that a league for special and limited purposes should prepare the way for federal union. The American States were allied in the prosecution of the war with England before they determined to form themselves into a permanent community. When the first burst of patriotic eloquence is exhausted, Lord CARNARVON's courteous invitation will perhaps be more calmly considered. The existence of a common enemy, or rather of a possible enemy, is a natural basis of friendly concert. If South Africa prefers weakness and confusion to combination, the mother-country will not be the principal sufferer.

THE ASSAULTS BILL.

IT would not be fair to blame Mr. CROSS for not giving a good reason for withdrawing the Assaults Bill. He might, as it happened, have given a very good reason indeed, but then it would not have been the one which really moved him to withdraw the Bill, and, moreover, it would not have been a reason which any Minister likes to give if he can help it. If Mr. CROSS could have seen his Bill as others see it, he would have been forced to confess that it was about as bad a Bill as could possibly have been brought in on the subject. Of the two changes in the law which experience had shown to be wanted, it only effected one, and that in a very imperfect and half-hearted way, while it did effect a change which no one had ever supposed to be wanted. The answers of the Judges to Mr. CROSS's questions brought out two things—first, that even the existing punishments for brutal assaults might be sufficient to restrain them, provided that they were inflicted with greater certainty; and, secondly, that the infliction of flogging in addition to the present punishment would probably be beneficial, especially in the case of young offenders. Mr. CROSS made no attempt to ensure greater certainty in the administration of the law as it stands. There was no question as to the cause to which the absence of certainty was due. It came from the disposition of the Justices to punish brutal assaults summarily, and therefore inadequately, instead of sending the case to the Assizes or to Quarter Sessions. By this means many offenders escaped with from one to six months' imprisonment, who, if they had been committed for trial, would probably have been sentenced to penal servitude. If Mr. CROSS had brought in a Bill to limit the jurisdiction of the Justices in Petty Sessions in cases of assault, and had refused to resort to flogging until the experiment of such limitation had been tried, it would have been a perfectly intelligible course. We should have held it to be a needlessly tentative method, inasmuch as we think that sufficient evidence in favour of flogging as a punishment for brutal crimes has already been obtained; but it is not a method which a Minister could have been blamed for preferring. Instead of doing this, Mr. CROSS brought in a Bill which added flogging to the punishments which can be inflicted for brutal assaults after conviction at Assizes or Quarter Sessions, but left the Justices as free as before to deal with brutal assaults at Petty Sessions. If the Bill had passed there would have been no greater certainty than there is now that an offender would get what he deserved; indeed, there would of the two have been even less certainty, since if foolishly humane Justices will not commit a man for trial when he can get only penal servitude, they would be still more unwilling to send him for trial when he might get a flogging into the bargain. It was a further fault in the Bill that it did not allow of flogging on a first conviction for brutal assault—that being of all others the time when it is most likely to answer its purpose; and this omission was scarcely atoned for by the infliction of flogging for sundry crimes which have not, so far as we know, increased in number of late years, and which seem to be already adequately punished in other ways.

If Mr. CROSS could have persuaded himself to assign the

badness of the Bill as a reason for abandoning it, his explanation might have been accepted in silence. The reasons which he did assign have no claim to a similar immunity from criticism. It will be observed that he carefully avoids saying that the Bill is withdrawn for want of time to carry it, and of itself this would be a ground for hoping that he had at last been brought to see that, in omitting all reference to the jurisdiction of Justices in Petty Session, he took up the question at the wrong end. Unfortunately, however, what he does say contradicts this theory. The Government, it appears, have decided to make further inquiries before going on with the Bill, and it will, if necessary, be brought forward in another year. Now, if there is one thing which is not required to enable Parliament to legislate on brutal assaults, it is further inquiry. The Government are in possession of the opinions of the Judges, which are of importance, and of those of a vast number of other persons, which, as a rule, are not of much importance. It is hard to say in what direction they can now push the investigation, unless, indeed, they take the opinion of the persons who are in the habit of committing brutal assaults. Perhaps this is Mr. Cross's intention, and in that case we may look for the appointment of a Royal Commission with power to examine persons suspected of crimes of violence under promise of indemnity, if they make a clean breast of it. The evidence thus obtained would help to enliven the recess, and it would at all events be as valuable as any the Government are likely to get from other sources. The reasons which Mr. Cross gives for thinking further inquiry necessary are that there ought not to be any panic legislation on the subject, and that the Judges have lately passed more severe sentences for brutal assaults. Certainly if the HOME SECRETARY was in a panic when he introduced the Bill, he contrived to keep his emotion under admirable control. The prevalence of brutal assaults, especially in Lancashire, had been a matter of notoriety for more than a year. The introduction of the Bill was delayed until the middle of the Session, and its author seemed to care so little for it that, when it was withdrawn on the 26th of July, it had not been read a second time. If this is legislating in a panic, what is Mr. Cross's idea of legislating at leisure? Perhaps to bring forward a Bill one Session, talk about it the next, and pass it in a third. As to the increased severity of the sentences passed by the Judges, it is not the Judges who have been in fault. If they had had sufficient opportunities of punishing this class of offenders, it is probable that brutal assaults would never have become so shamefully common. If Mr. Cross could say that Justices have lately been less disposed to deal with crimes of violence at Petty Sessions, it would be something to the purpose. But we do not know that any evidence in support of this theory can be brought forward, and even if there were positive proof of it, the change might be only the result of a momentary deference to public opinion. At all events, it could not be trusted to survive Mr. Cross's little speech. He has chosen to play into the hands of those pseudo-humanitarians whose tenderness for the criminal leads them to forget the sufferings of those whom he has injured. Whatever be the motives which lead Justices to treat brutal assaults as matters of little moment, those motives will now resume their former sway. The Liverpool Town Council, which so bitterly resented the comments called forth by the murder of MORGAN, will in future be able to quote the HOME SECRETARY in support of their serene indifference to human life. When they are asked to increase the police force, or to take any special measures for making certain parts of the town less of a purgatory for quiet people, they will cry "No panic legislation!" It is difficult to take up such a subject as this and let it drop again without making things worse than they were before.

The abandonment of the Assaults Bill is not only a sign of weakness on the part of the Government, it is also an additional symptom of that peculiar form of weakness which was still more conspicuously displayed in the withdrawal of the Merchant Shipping Bill. There are a large number of persons to whom the passing of a good Assaults Bill would have been of immense importance. But they are persons of very humble condition, and absolutely without the power of organization. If the ordinary victims of brutal assaults had belonged to the upper classes, there might not have been any panic legislation, but there would certainly have been less delay in legislation. As it is, it is the poor who suffer by the prevalence of this form of crime, and the poor can wait without the stability

of the Government being in any way damaged. Mr. Cross forgets how many women there are who live in constant terror of life and limb; how many towns there are in which inoffensive dwellers in certain streets and lanes cannot go about their business without running the risk of being maimed or left for dead, to gratify the aimless brutality of some gang of roughs; and how many instances of violence would be brought to light, if those who witnessed them were not afraid of provoking the vengeance of the offenders by venturing to give evidence against them. If the needs of these people were overlooked by the late Government, there was at least the excuse that those who overlooked them were busy about large measures. The present Government have overlooked them while engaged in no more heroic legislation than a Bill which allows Friendly Societies to be frank about their affairs, unless they prefer being reticent, and another which creates a statutory contract of which landlords and tenants are permitted to avail themselves, unless they like another form of contract better.

FOREIGN POOR LAWS.

THE inquiries into the Foreign Poor Law system, which were instituted at the suggestion of Mr. STANSFELD, have been published, with a valuable introduction by Mr. ANDREW DOYLE. The most interesting feature in these Reports is the account they give of the experience of countries whose legislation on this subject has a general resemblance to our own. Only three States—Denmark, Sweden, and Prussia—fall under this head, and of these only Denmark has a tax exclusively devoted to the relief of the poor. The right of every destitute person to receive assistance from the public is distinctly recognized in the Constitutional Charter of Denmark, and this recognition only embodies in a positive enactment a principle which has always been the foundation of the Danish Poor Law. Poor relief has hitherto been distributed with the same laxity that prevailed in England before 1834, and the consequences of a system which destroys all inducements to industry and thrift among the poor have been equally marked in the two countries. Count HOLSTEIN, writing in 1833, describes the working of the Poor Law in terms which might have been borrowed without alteration by the English Poor Law Commission. He points out that there is no dread of poverty, so that the man who finds himself becoming less prosperous in the world is not stimulated to arrest his progress downwards by the prospect of ultimate destitution. Reckless marriages are encouraged by the certainty that the family will be provided for by the State. Economy is regarded as unnecessary for the same reason. The poor and the rich are alike demoralized, the one by looking to the provision made for him by others as a matter of right, the other by being obliged to give, and consequently having no place for the exercise of charity. In the Danish workhouses there is no regular discipline, no restriction upon the liberty of the inmates in the matter of going in and out, and no prohibition of luxuries like tobacco and brandy. Free medical attendance and medicine are enjoyed by almost every labourer. The evils incident to this state of things led to the appointment, in 1869, of a Commission of Inquiry, the recommendations of which exactly square with the opinions of Poor Law reformers in this country. The Commissioners advise a complete separation between public and private charity, and the restriction of public relief to "such individuals as are absolutely unable to work—that is to say, to children, aged and weak persons." The workhouse system is to be largely developed, outdoor relief is to be allowed very sparingly, and the recipients of public relief are not to receive any further aid from private charity. As regards the restriction of outdoor relief, and the prohibition of public and private relief being given to the same person, the recommendations of the Danish Commission are in advance of our own practice.

In Sweden a still more stringent system has actually been in operation since 1871. By this law outdoor relief is altogether forbidden, and a kind of modified servitude is established for all paupers. The Swedish Boards of Guardians are invested with a "right of mastership" over every person who is in receipt of poor relief, or whose wife or child is wholly maintained by the Union. This last conception is one that is only beginning to be understood in England. The relation between Guardians and paupers in the case of outdoor

relief, at all events, is too often regarded as at an end when the weekly dole has been given. Mr. DOYLE mentions that at a recent conference of representative Guardians a clergyman declared, in answer to a suggestion that relief should generally be given in kind, that a pauper has as much right to spend at his pleasure the relief he receives from the parish as a working-man has to spend at his pleasure the money he earns by his labour. This gentleman is an *ex officio* Guardian of the poor, and if there are many like him in his Union it is a wonder if the major part of the population are not pauperized. Another valuable provision of the Swedish Poor Law is an enactment that employers shall be liable for their workmen during the time for which they are engaged in their service, so that they may not become chargeable to the Union. The mischievous doctrine of relief in aid of wages is thus completely upset. The poor have to choose between living by their own labour or living at the cost of the community. They cannot mix up the two states of life, and accept work at insufficient wages with the intention of supplementing them by a grant from the rates. If this principle were adopted in England, it would make short work of much of the distress that prevails in many large towns, and in some of the worst paid agricultural districts. Wages could not ordinarily fall below the point at which they are sufficient to sustain life, because so long as a man was in receipt of wages at all he would not be able to claim poor relief.

In Prussia relief in the workhouse is regarded as semi-penal. It has the character, says Mr. PLUNKET, "of a modified House of Correction, and is principally used by the police, who can order vagrants, tramps, or drunkards to be confined there for any period, from one day to two years." The ordinary relief is all outdoor relief, the object of the authorities being "to avoid as far as possible severing families." This is more intelligible than the statement which immediately follows, that they are equally anxious to avoid "doing anything which tends to diminish the feeling of independence and self-reliance." Here in England we have learned to regard outdoor relief as almost incompatible with the carrying out of any such purpose. It must be remembered, however, that outdoor relief in Prussia is administered with very much more care and supervision than has ever been brought to bear on it among ourselves. There is great reason to doubt, however, whether this care and supervision can be continuously given on a large scale, and also whether, even if it could, the minute and inquisitorial investigations on which it is necessarily based would be found consonant with English ideas. It is admitted by those who most admire the system, which is seen in perfection at Leipzig and Elberfeld, that an inquiry which is to ascertain the existence of destitution without the aid of a "test" such as that furnished by the offer of relief in a workhouse must be very searching. In order to make it sufficiently searching it must be conducted by agents peculiarly qualified for the duty by intelligence and social position. And to secure the services of such agents, it must not involve more time and labour than men engaged in professions or in business can afford to devote to it. If such a system were now introduced into England, it is probable that these conditions might for a time be fulfilled in large towns. But it is not likely that a sufficient number of competent inquirers would continue to be forthcoming after the enthusiasm attendant on the first trial of a new experiment had passed away. In Hamburg, where a similar system was formerly in use, the inquiries were undertaken by one hundred and eighty gentlemen, and the arrangement seems to have been successful only so long as they continued to work. In country districts there would often be no one competent to investigate with sufficient minuteness the circumstances of the applicants, and the result would be that the administration of relief would in many cases fall into the hands of benevolent persons whose one idea of dispensing it would be to give to every one that asked them. Mr. DOYLE mentions that the experiment "has been tried in this country, and tried under exceptional, ally favourable circumstances"; but he adds that it has not succeeded.

A reference to the list of inquiries which are made at Leipzig will be enough to show how little applicable any system to which they are indispensable would be to the habits and feelings of Englishmen. Every applicant for relief is asked, in addition to a long list of more commonplace questions, whether he keeps any domestic animal, whether he has ever

been convicted of any offence, and if so, what has been his conduct since the expiration of his sentence, what are his earnings, what rent he pays, whether he has any furniture or jewelry or money in the savings bank, or money due from any club either to himself in sickness or to his representatives after his death, and whether he owes any money or has any goods in pawn. Similar inquiries are made about him of the police, who in Germany come a good deal nearer to omniscience than they do in England. The visitor inquires whether the applicant has a settlement in the town, whether he is industrious and orderly, or idle and drunken, whether he is of dissolute habits, whether he has ever been punished for any offence, and generally what the police know and think about him. "Long experience," says Mr. DOYLE, "has convinced German administrators that no investigation less minute and inquisitorial could be safely substituted for the discarded test of the 'workhouse.' English administrators must be strangely ignorant of their countrymen if they think that an investigation equally minute and inquisitorial would have any chance of being tolerated. It appears that the countries from which we have most to learn are those which have learnt most from us. Denmark is on the eve of adopting, Sweden has already adopted, a system in which the principles of the Poor Law of 1834 are carried out with the greater consistency that comes from an additional experience of forty years. A careful study of this new experiment in the direction of more stringent administration of poor relief may supply our own authorities with several useful lessons."

BISHOP THIRLWALL AS AN HISTORIAN.

THE name of another great scholar has to be added, alongside of the names of Finlay and Willis, to the list of those whom death has taken from us within a year of which little more than half has as yet passed. It may be that a generation which has not yet learned to know the name of Finlay has already forgotten the name of Thirlwall. But those who know what writing history really is, and who know the powers which it calls for—those who hold that two good books on the same subject are better than one, and who do not think that the appearance of the second makes the former useless—they will feel that one of the few men at whose feet the learner might sit in the full trust that he would never be misled has passed away from among us. Of three great English historians of Greece, three men of whom any age and land might have been proud, all now have gone, and two have gone within a few months of each other. The two men who have, between them, told in our own tongue the tale of Greece, from her earliest to her latest days, were in life far apart from one another in their callings and in their places of abode. They were yet further apart in the motives and circumstances which led them severally to undertake the task of which each of them so well discharged his own share. In the life of each there was a contemplative and a practical stage; but those stages came in reverse order in the lives of the two men. The writings of one deal wholly with a distant past; the writings of the other begin indeed from the distant past, but carry on the tale down to days in which the historian recorded events in which he had been an actor. The man who went out to fight for Greece lived on in the land which he had helped to free to be at once her historian and her censor. The other, a scholar from his cradle, finished his one great work early in life, and was then called away to practical life in a post as toilsome and difficult as any that could be found within the range of his calling. This marked contrast in the position of the two men leaves its impress on their writings. It is vain to argue which does his work the better of the two. Each does it as it was natural that he should do it in the position in which he found himself, and from the point of view in which he necessarily looked on his subject. It is enough to say that, between them, they have told the whole tale of Greece, and that each has told his part of it as it never was told before him. It may well be that the tale which they have told at least by halves may some day be wrought into a connected whole. But whoever undertakes such a task as this must feel like the man who deals with any part of history which comes within the thirteen hundred years that Gibbon has made his own. Though he may expand, and even improve, on particular points, he is still only building on the foundations of the great ones who have gone before him.

The position of Mr. Finlay and that of Bishop Thirlwall differ again in this. Mr. Finlay had his subject, as a whole, to himself. It is only in the latest stage of his narrative that he has any worthy competitor in any tongue. Bishop Thirlwall too may be said to have his subject, as a whole, to himself. There is not, in English at least, any work of the same class which goes through the whole tale, from the Achæans of Homer to the Achæans of Polybios. But if he has no rival in dealing with the whole tale, he has most formidable rivals in dealing, not merely with fragments of it, but with parts only just short of the whole. We said that Bishop Thirlwall and Mr. Finlay have written the History of Greece by halves. Their writings might really be read as a con-

tinuous story. This could not be done with the Histories either of Grote or of Curtius, both of which break off too soon for the purpose. Mr. Cox's History cannot enter into the competition, if only because it is as yet a mere fragment, and we know not at what point it may end. It appears from his preface that his design is to tell the tale from the beginning to the end, to write the two halves represented by Thirlwall and Finlay. But as yet his work can be spoken of only as a fragment. Arnold, with wonderful insight, saw that the proper ending for his own work was the coronation of Charles the Great; but what we actually have of it breaks off before the overthrow of Hannibal. The competitors of Bishop Thirlwall, as far as English readers are concerned, are Grote and Curtius, counting Curtius as English in his English dress. We fear that a generation has sprung up to whom it may seem strange to speak of the three as competitors. If it be so, the seeming strangeness only shows in how shallow and hasty a way some people carry on their studies. We have said often before that he who would really master Grecian history cannot afford to part with any of the three. Each is, beyond comparison, better than the other two, in some essential part of their common subject. We cannot do without Mr. Grote's exposition of the Athenian democracy. We cannot do without the pictures of Greek geography, of Greek art, of general Greek life which are given us by Curtius. But neither can we do without the narrative of those parts of Grecian history which Mr. Grote slurred over, and with a great part of which Curtius has not grappled at all. Curtius ends at Chairoonia; Grote ends, it is not exactly easy to say where; Thirlwall alone goes on, through Macedonian and Federal times, down to the fall of Corinth. And it is in a part of these later times, in the age of Philip and Alexander, that Bishop Thirlwall rises to his highest. He soars there more indisputably and immeasurably above his two competitors than we can say that his two competitors ever soar above him. And, as contrasted with Curtius, he has this special merit. Mr. Grote brought new lights to bear on many parts of Grecian history, and consequently explained many things in a different way from that in which Bishop Thirlwall explained them before him. On these points we hold that Mr. Grote is right; but we could not bring ourselves to say that Bishop Thirlwall is wrong. He is wrong only in the sense in which all are wrong before a new discovery is revealed. But Curtius on several important points shuts his eyes to lights which he might have used. Thirlwall is pre-Grotian only chronologically because he wrote before Grote. Curtius wrote after Grote, and yet in many places he is pre-Grotian wilfully. And, if we are driven to cast away parts of the beginning of Bishop Thirlwall's work as pre-scientific, we must do the same with Mr. Grote's also. That we have so to speak is no blame to either of them; it simply shows how quickly some branches of knowledge have advanced, that much of what they wrote became antiquated while they were still living. But because we have got beyond the treatment which either of them applied to the earliest times, beyond the half-believing treatment of Thirlwall, beyond the negative treatment of Grote, that in no way lessens the value of those parts of their Histories in which each in his turn reigns supreme. Because we now go elsewhere for an exposition of mythical narratives, we must still go to Grote if we would do justice to the democracy of Athens; we must still go to Thirlwall if we would do justice to those by whom the democracy of Athens was brought low.

The merits of Bishop Thirlwall's History are those solid and sterling merits which may seem but little attractive either to those who set more store by prettiness or brilliancy than by accuracy, or to those who simply run after the newest thing, whether it be better or worse than the old. The distinguishing characters of Bishop Thirlwall's narrative are unflinching accuracy and unswerving judgment. It would be rash to say that even he never made a mistake, but he certainly made as few mistakes as any man. And no historian ever wrote less in the spirit of an advocate, or more in the spirit of a judge. No man was ever less awayed either by passion or caprice. The natural complaint against such a writer is that he is cold; and cold he doubtless is. But it is a coldness which is consistent with clearness, with vigour, with high narrative power, with many passages of true, if condensed, eloquence, and with a sarcastic turn, one form of which it might have been better to have kept more under restraint. Bishop Thirlwall did quite right to point out both the blunders and the unfairness of Mitford; but it would have been better to have pointed them out in some other shape than that of allusive sneers at a man who is never named. And it would have been no more than justice to have pointed out that Mitford's work, with all its monstrous faults, still had the merit of being the first to deal with the old Greeks as with living men. But sarcasm was part of Bishop Thirlwall's nature. If any one wished to put together a collection of the calmest and most cutting sayings that man ever uttered, he might cull them from Bishop Thirlwall's writings, both historical and official. But his sarcasm, however biting, was always calm and unimpassioned. There are other episcopal writings where the attempted sarcasm reads simply like a display of ill-temper.

For we must not forget that the man who was the historian of Greece was also the Bishop of St. David's. There may be a doubt whether that calm and judicial intellect was not in some measure thrown away in the particular post in which he was placed. "Embodied day," as we have heard him called by one who knew him well, must sometimes have seemed strange to the unlearned and passionate spirits among whom his lot was cast. But he carried into his vast and rugged diocese a sense of duty in which

none surpassed him. It was something to be the first for so many generations among the successors of St. David, who, a stranger by birth and speech to those to whom he was sent, made it his business to learn the tongue of so large a part of his people, and Englishman as he was to speak to Britons in the British tongue. And though, under the present circumstances of that diocese, no one would call on a Bishop of St. David's to fix his usual dwelling-place in the remote home of his early predecessors, still it was something that he was not wholly a stranger within those venerable precincts. It was a privilege not to be forgotten by those who have shared it to see such a man on such a spot.

The last public act of Bishop Thirlwall's life was to withdraw from a post which he had begun to find beyond his strength. And it must have been no small satisfaction to him in his short remaining time of retirement to see the staff which he had laid down pass into the hands of the fittest of all successors. It was indeed no small matter for rejoicing that the same calm judgment, the same judicial and historical spirit, the same unswerving love of truth, could be found in one who was brought immediately from the same distant part of England as Thirlwall himself, but who, in going to St. David's as the scene of his episcopal labours, was only going back again to his own land and people.

The reputation of Bishop Thirlwall as a scholar rests of course mainly on his great historical work. His episcopal writings would form an instructive collection, illustrating many things in the ecclesiastical history of our own times. But we must not forget that, while he was an historian of Greece in his own person, he was also one of the two who introduced the Roman History of Niebuhr to English readers. And one feature of Thirlwall's early life must not be passed by. It is but seldom that a childish prodigy comes to much eminence in after years. At all events, he has to struggle against great difficulties, if he is allowed to know that he is a prodigy. We are now dealing with the life of one who stood that test. With more than doubtful wisdom the father of the late Bishop published, when his son was seven or eight years old, the "Primitiæ" of Connop Thirlwall, with the child's likeness as a frontispiece. Many a boy's head would have been turned for life by such undesirable prominence at so early an age. It is no small praise that the childish writer of the "Primitiæ" should have lived to be the writer of the History of Greece, that one who could look back to a sermon printed while he was still in the nursery should live to sit with honour on an episcopal throne, and to put forth utterances from that throne of which one can only regret that they were, to some extent, a case of preaching in the wilderness.

DRAMATIC CONDITIONS.

A QUESTION debated in many minds just now is the possible revival of the drama. When one of the chief poets of the day, who had previously written nothing of the kind, appears as a playwright, hope naturally awakes. Such was the brilliancy of our Elizabethan era that we can never cease to be dazzled by it—never cease to think of it as the golden age of our literature, and therefore as an age the forms and modes of which are always to be aspired after. It is true that since those palmy days the decline and fall of our drama has been steady and complete, but yet we cannot help hoping that it may rise again. We cannot reconcile ourselves to the extinction of the glory of our literature. We know that there are "flaming ministers" whose former light can be restored, and we are eager to believe this to be one of them. And yet for that "cunning'st pattern of excellency," as we may well call the Elizabethan drama, when its flame is put out, who knows "where is that Promethean heat that can" its "light relume"?

It may be worth while considering for a moment two of the conditions under which our drama thrives so splendidly at the close of the sixteenth century. Let us notice first the active intellectuality of the Elizabethan age; and, secondly, that it was not a time when books were abundant, or the study of them a common habit. Out of many circumstances that must co-exist, if a drama is to prosper, there are certainly two of them most important. There must be a thirsty nation, and it must slake its thirst, not at books, but at plays. The demand will create the supply. If a people, roused by keen intellectual impulses, turns to the stage for the satisfaction of its wants, the stage will be found responsive. "The drink divine" which is asked for by "the thirst that from the soul doth rise" will assuredly be provided. It is only at certain junctures that a people will so turn; but at them it will not turn in vain. Both at Athens and in London, when the nation crowded to the theatre, the theatre gave it a royal welcome.

It is hardly necessary to point out how various and how intense was the mental activity of the Elizabethan age. Life in England has never been broader and deeper than it was then. It was morning with us, so to speak. We were waking to a fresh consciousness of ourselves and of the world around us. The old things had passed away; and behold, all things were become new.

Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive;
But to be young was very heaven!

A strange sense of power thrilled us; and the revelation of unsuspected opportunities for exertion and enterprise transformed our inmost being. The very earth widened around us; and, where but yesterday there rose forbidding barriers, there now spread far away an endless expanse of unexplored regions, mysterious, fascinating,

delightful. And as with material confinements, so it was with spiritual. In the universe of thought the mind wandered free. For good and for evil, it defied the restraints of previous dogmatism, and stepped boldly within precincts from which it had been rigorously interdicted. Was there ever in England such another age of movement? an age so eager, so fearless, so sanguine, so exultant in its liberty, so swift to do or die? Never, perhaps, was the national imagination so quickened and so vigorous. Every day produced its poet.

The isle is full of noises,
Sounds and sweet airs that give delight and hurt not.

Nor could it be otherwise. A land so bright-hearted could not but break forth into singing. Joy, even as sorrow, must have words given it; the joy

that does not speak
Whispers the o'erfraught heart and bids it break.

There is no more striking recognition of the keen intelligence of the Elizabethans, and the readiness and facility of their imaginations, than is afforded by Shakspeare himself in the choruses of his *Henry V.* Reading them, one sees how a Shakspeare was possible. They show us how he could rely, and how he did rely, upon his audience. Conscious of the grotesque contrast between the "unworthy scaffold" of the Globe and the "so great an object" brought forth upon it—

Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?—

he can appeal to the spectators to make up all the deficiencies. "Let us," he says,

On your imaginary forces work.

Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts;
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance;
Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth;
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings,
Carry them here and there; jumping o'er times,
Turning the accomplishment of many years
Into an hour-glass.

In another prologue he bids them—

Play with your fancies, and in them behold
Upon the hempen tackle ship-boys climbing.

O, do but think,
You stand upon the rivage and behold
A city on the inconstant billows dancing.

Follow, follow;
Grapple your minds to sternage of this navy.

Work, work your thoughts, and therein see a siege;

Still be kind,
And eke out our performance with your mind.

In the prologue of the last act there is a very noticeable phrase:—

But now behold,
In the quick forge and working house of thought,
How London doth pour out her citizens.

The fires in the forge of thought burnt brightly in the Elizabethan age, and the hands wrought busily in its working house.

"When the cheerfulness of the people is so sprightly up, as that it has not only wherewith to guard well its own freedom, but to spare, and to bestow upon the solidest and sublimest points of controversy and new inventions," a great literature may be reasonably expected; but the form will not always be the same. In the Elizabethan age, with its social habits, with its gaiety of spirit, its delight in action, the form could not but be dramatic. The particular consideration we have here to entertain is that it was not an age given to books and to book-study. It was the age of *L'Allegro*, rather than of *Il Penseroso*. It found its pleasure in an oral literature. The stage exactly answered to its necessities, and so all of a sudden it sprang up to its perfection. It is strange to think that one of the writers of *Gorboduc*, the play that is known as our first tragedy, lived to see *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. Just so in Greece, under highly similar conditions, the drama leapt to its maturity. Æschylus might have seen Thespis perform. Sophocles was nearly twenty years old when Phrynichus exhibited his *Phronissæ*.

It ought to be carefully remembered that the Elizabethan plays were written to be acted, not to be read. This characteristic is stamped upon them. They are the result of immediate contact between the people and the author. In this connexion between the dramatist and his audience there is something not to be found in other kinds of literature. Criticism is not distant and possibly powerless, but instantaneous and decisive. Every genuine dramatic literature may be said in a very special sense to be the creation of the circle to which it belongs. The Elizabethan drama was the creation of its circle, and that circle was the nation. The people did not play at plays, as we do nowadays. With us books are real things, with them the theatre was a real thing. They believed in it. It is true there were certain religionists, well meaning but rudely cultivated men, who stood aloof from it; but the nation as a whole rejoiced in it ardently. Let us thoroughly realize this signal fact, that in the absence of books and

newspapers, and other now most common means of information and culture, the drama was then the one literature of the day. It was everything to that age. To such an extent was it so as to be in danger of degradation in artistic respects. It was in danger of being used for political and controversial purposes—a danger not always escaped. In several extant plays one may see how the drama was made to perform the function of the pamphlet, or of the modern newspaper, a function which the old comedy at Athens performed freely. In this respect the jealousy with which the drama was watched by authority was of real service to its true development. It saved it from a thousand snares to which it was exposed by its very popularity. The very existence of that jealousy is highly significant of the influence and power of the drama that excited it. In short, the theatre was at that time the great centre of English art and thought. It drew to itself the highest intellects of the time; it dealt with the highest and gravest questions; it portrayed with incomparable power the deepest and intensest passions.

All thoughts, all passions, all delights,
Whatever stirs this mortal frame—

all were but ministers of the Elizabethan drama, and fed its "sacred flame."

A time came when the intellect of the nation looked elsewhere for its sustenance, and it was then that the drama decayed. Books gradually came within everybody's reach and to everybody's liking; and in delighted communion with master minds through such media, men no longer flocked to the play-houses, once resonant with the life and the joy of the nation. With less gregarious habits the quiet and calm of the study charmed more than the excitement and noise of the theatre. Fascinated, as we must ever be, by the dramatic form, modern days may perhaps successfully develop for themselves a new species of drama—the Reading Drama, as we may call it, as distinguished from the Acting; and into this new species an immortal life may be breathed by another race of geniuses, who may find in it the fittest embodiment for thoughts that wake to perish never; but that the theatre, however it may be improved, can ever again be what it once was seems merely impossible. Our voices change as we grow older, and so the voice of literature changes, and the old tones cannot be brought back, charm we never so wisely.

THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE AT CANTERBURY.

WE know not whose was the oracular voice which bade the

Archæological Institute turn its steps to the cradle of the Society; but the wisdom of his counsel has been proved by the result. There is nothing that succeeds like success, and this second Canterbury meeting has been a remarkably successful one. The attendance has been large and of a good class; the lectures and papers were much above the recent average; the objects of interest in the city and neighbourhood everywhere found admirable exponents; and the excursions were well arranged, and not too long. The Museum was unusually rich and varied, with its different departments well represented; and nothing was omitted to make the meeting a pleasant one. In regard to the former visit of archæologists to Canterbury in the year 1844, the earliest of all the archæological congresses, either general or local, it must be borne in mind that it cannot correctly be spoken of as a meeting of the "Institute." The "Archæological Institute" proper dates its birth, as a separate Society, from the meeting at Winchester in 1845. The body that met at Canterbury one-and-thirty years ago was "the British Archæological Association"; a title still retained by the sister Society, to whom it was gracefully yielded on the occurrence of the schism which at the very outset of its career threatened the existence of the new confraternity. If the schism was a necessary evil at the time, the necessity has passed away with the chief actors, and all who have the interests of archæology at heart will rejoice if, as Canterbury in 1844 saw the opening of the breach, Canterbury in 1875 may witness the first steps towards its repair. The counsels for reunion given by Lord Houghton at Ripon are not less salutary than they were a year ago.

In one respect the meeting of 1844 was an example to all subsequent archæological meetings. The members were not always running away from the place of gathering to distant, and often far less interesting, spots, but seem to have devoted themselves conscientiously to the investigation of the antiquities of Canterbury itself. With the exception of a run to Brean Down, where barrows were opened under pitiless rain, and Dr. Buckland, the geological Dean of Westminster, played practical jokes, the only excursion was that to Richborough. On the late occasion, Canterbury was certainly not left out of the scheme, but the time devoted to it was too limited for a place so rich in archæological interest. On the opening day, after the inaugural meeting, with its address of welcome and the speech of Sir Walter James, acting for Lord FitzWalter, the invalided local President—the chief point of which was the hearty recognition of Mr. Green's *History of the English People* as marking a new period in historical writing—the afternoon was spent in a perambulation of the city. After traversing the site of the walls and earthworks, which Mr. Clark explained very clearly, the huge earthen mound of Dane-John gave an opening for rival theories as to its date. For once, Mr. Clark's view was the less tenable, and the British origin of the work, as asserted for it by Mr. Parker and Mr. Octavius Morgan, was fully

confirmed the next day by Mr. Godfrey-Faussett's able paper on the early history of Canterbury. The discreditable condition of the very curious Norman keep hard by, in which Lewis the Dauphin received the submission of the men of Canterbury, now the coal-store of the gasworks, called forth an indignant protest from Mr. Clark. From this point the perambulation became somewhat vague, and, for want of a better plan, much that ought to have been visited was omitted. The Eastgate Hospital, with its very curious Early English hall—so exactly like a church in plan and arrangement as to deceive the best informed—and Perpendicular chapel; the early Decorated Refectory of the Black Friars, separated from the main body of the convent by a branch of the Stour; the Grey Friars, actually built over the river; and not a few other buildings of no small interest, were passed over, and left to be discovered by individual research. Even the remains of St. Augustine's, the most interesting site in England, though the party passed its gates, did not either then or subsequently receive any official visit or elucidation, and not a few of the members probably left without having any idea that there was more to be seen than the buildings of the front court, or having their attention directed to the grand fragment of the Norman Abbey church, or to the remains of the cloister, refectory, and hexagonal kitchen, recently disinterred by the antiquarian zeal of the Warden. At St. Pancras' Chapel, the traditional site of the early Romano-British church, which after Pagan desecration became Queen Bertha's Chapel, and still bears the marks of the claws of the demon indignantly fleeing at the touch of holy water, another disappointment awaited the party. The interior proved inaccessible; even the most adventurous, who, by help of a ladder, craned over the wall, could discern little. Perhaps the owner had a wholesome dread of the indignation that would be awakened by the spectacle of its desecration, and wisely forbade all access. Is there no hope of the authorities of St. Augustine's obtaining the site? The walk finished with St. Martin's Church, the supposed place of Ethelbert's baptism and Bertha's burial. Beyond the old materials worked up in the walls, and possibly a chancel doorway with an arch turned in Roman brick, the existing church, as was pointed out in a paper by the Rector, the Rev. A. B. Strettell, contains hardly anything earlier than the thirteenth century. The font, which used to be shown as that in which Ethelbert was baptized, is certainly not earlier than the eleventh century. The shallow carving of its bowl is identical with that on the tympanum of the belfry door of the Norman tower of St. Clement's, Sandwich, visited on Thursday. It was pleasing to find this interesting church in such good condition and evidently so well cared for. Not a few who had known and loved him paused to look sadly at the last resting-place of the late accomplished Dean Alford. *Deversorium viatoris Hierosolymam proficiscentis.*

Wednesday was the great day for reading papers. The hall of St. Augustine's had been courteously placed at the disposal of the Institute by the Warden and Fellows, and the chair was taken by Mr. Beresford Hope, as President of the Architectural Section, who opened the proceedings with a graphic sketch of the gradual degradation of the buildings to a brewhouse and a casino, and the rededication of the hallowed site to the missionary work of the Church. One trifling inaccuracy in Mr. Hope's address may be noticed lest it should prove misleading. The building occupying the site of the present library may have been a refectory, perhaps the abbot's hall, but it was not the refectory—i.e. the conventual dining hall. That, as recent excavations have proved, stood in its normal place, parallel to the nave of the church, and, as at the sister monastery of Christ Church, on the north side of the cloister. We could not hear whether Mr. Mackenzie Walcott's paper on St. Augustine's threw any fresh light on the purpose of the buildings to the west of the cloister. The mission of the Precentor of Chichester lies more in the laborious collection than in the sifting or arrangement of materials, nor are his conclusions to be accepted without question. The lecture of Sir Gilbert Scott on the Transitional style, as exemplified in the choir of Canterbury Cathedral, which formed a chief feature of the late congress, displayed, as was to be anticipated, a master's thorough grasp of his subject, "focussing his facts" as never before had been done. The illustrations which so profusely covered the walls attested the wide range of his observation. The examples from Jerusalem and Constantinople were especially valuable as facts in the history of comparative architecture. The germ of a volume on the history of the Transition, as Mr. Hope observed, lay in this remarkable essay. We trust that it may not remain, like too many of the promised works of his great predecessor, Professor Willis, an unwritten book. The paper that followed, by Mr. Godfrey-Faussett, on the primeval history of Canterbury, already referred to, was equally a masterpiece in its own department. The brief title of the paper, "Canterbury till Domesday," read rather startlingly. Some began to inquire whether the mantle of Dr. Cumming had fallen on the accomplished Chapter clerk. But the paper was that of an historian, not a prophet, in which the entire absence of hypothesis or theory was very refreshing. Every step was on solid ground, and each was made good before another was taken. The appearance in the pages of the Journal of this invaluable addition to Kentish topography will be looked for with interest. The Dean of Westminster was to have succeeded Mr. Faussett with a sketch of the history of the monastery of Christ Church. But his train was unpunctual, and his arrival was so late that the reading was postponed to the evening. It may perhaps be doubted whether

it would have been an irreparable loss if the paper had been omitted altogether. It was evident that the multitudinous avocations of Dean Stanley had prevented his doing justice to the subject. His lecture was gossiping rather than historical, consisting of somewhat desultory selections from voluminous notes, in which it was not easy to trace any order or drift of argument. Slips are very easily made in a lecture of this kind, in which the best informed are not always safe from inaccuracy of statement; but it was curious to be told by the President of the Historical Section that all our English Cathedrals were originally monastic; that the Norman Infirmary was of the fourteenth century; and that the "orientation" of the Anglo-Saxon basilica was to the west and not to the east, the fact being, as Willis has shown, that the church had two apses, and that, though the Archbishop's chair was behind the altar in the western apse, in which position he celebrated facing eastwards, the principal altar, raised on its *confessio*, was, as was invariably the case in English churches, to the east. It seemed hard also that, because Lanfranc had removed the ruins of a fabric which had been burnt down, and which, if it had been standing unharmed, would have been insufficient for his largely increased monastic body, he should be accredited with a desire to eradicate all traces of the Anglo-Saxon church and monastery. We had thought that the notion of this rooted aversion of the Norman to the Anglo-Saxon race had been long since exploded. Does the Dean still swear by Thierry? Our narrow limits forbid our doing more than mention the excellent papers contributed by Mr. Loftie on the stained glass of the thirteenth century in the Cathedral, illustrative of the history of Becket, and by Mr. Sheppard on the Cathedral muniments, which owe much to his care and skill in deciphering and arranging them.

The description of the Cathedral and precincts was undertaken by Precentor Venables of Lincoln and Mr. J. H. Parker. To judge from the large numbers that gathered, this was the most popular part of the whole proceedings. The meeting first assembled in the Chapter-House, where Mr. Venables gave a sketch of the architectural history of the Cathedral. What he said was, as he plainly acknowledged, based entirely on the researches of the late Professor Willis, by whose plans and drawings, but for a singular and unfortunate misapprehension, the lecture would have been illustrated; but it was evident both in the lecture and the subsequent descriptive perambulation that Mr. Venables had taken great pains to verify every statement and understand the exact meaning and relative bearing of the facts. He called special attention to the unique character of the Metropolitan Church of all England in the singularity of its ground plan, the complexity of its parts, the character of the architecture of its eastern limb, the stone screens which, instead of the more customary wooden canopies, surround the choir, and, above all, in the noble flights of steps, tier above tier, by which the altar is elevated to so towering a height. The strong condemnation passed on the demolition forty years ago by the Dean and Chapter of the north-western tower, that noble fragment of Lanfranc's work, so grand in its stern simplicity, called forth a loyal defence of his predecessors from Canon Robertson. It might have been spared. No one questions that Dean Percy and his Chapter acted up to their lights, and were guided by a sincere desire for the improvement of their Cathedral; but past experience unhappily shows, nowhere more forcibly than in our Cathedrals, how much mischief may be done with the best intentions. Canon Robertson did better and, we think, more congenial, work when later on he exposed the modern origin and baseless character of what has been termed "the verger's tale," though it is, we believe, given up by the more sensible among them, of the little piece of stone said to have been cut out as a relic from the pavement of the Martyrdom, and to be preserved at St. Mary Major's at Rome. Each strand of the triple cord of evidence—local tradition, Baronius's statement, and the supposed existence of the relic at Rome—was tested and proved to be rotten. The tradition cannot be traced higher than the beginning of the present century; Baronius speaks only of the martyr's blood, and says nothing about any stone; and, finally, no such relic is to be found at St. Mary Major's.

An impending work of restoration to which Mr. Venables directed attention called forth the expression of some well-founded anxiety lest again, with the best intentions, another step should be taken in the wrong direction. It will be remembered that the choir of Canterbury is almost unique among our English Cathedrals, though we have a similar example at the daughter church of Rochester of stalls backed with lightly pierced stone screens, instead of being canopied, as is more usual, with rich tabernacle work. These screens, long concealed with Tenison's rich but incongruous Corinthian panelling, were brought to light a quarter of a century ago by the removal of the wood-work along the sides of the choir. The panelling at the west end, with the stalls for the dignitaries, was allowed to remain. Behind this, as Sir Gilbert Scott has recently discovered and made known in the pages of the *Archæological Journal*, the Decorated Screen is still preserved, and, as far as the upper part is concerned, in all its pristine beauty. The carving is absolutely uninjured, and no words can adequately describe its exquisite grace. The natural course would seem to be at once to complete the work begun thirty years ago, by the removal of the classical panelling, and the rehabilitation of the original screen, "duly and faithfully executed," to adopt Sir Gilbert Scott's words, "according to existing evidences, untampered with by modern ideas and prepossessions." But we were astonished to learn that it was by no means certain that this

course would be adopted, and that, as a feeling prevailed that the mediæval choir arrangements at Canterbury were flat and cold as compared with other cathedrals, it had been proposed to erect a set of canopied stalls in oak for the dean and canons at the west end. We cannot, however, suppose that such a mistake will be committed. Deans and Chapters have no right to alter the mediæval features of the cathedrals of which they are simply the guardians according to their own taste, or to gratify an unintelligent popular demand. If they wish to relieve the present baldness and bareness of the choir, the right way is open to them. Let them restore the rich mediæval colouring still to be seen in the western division, and decorate the space below the traceried screens, now covered with monotonous red cloth, with rich hangings of varied hues. With so much vulgar polychromatic work to be seen in some restored churches, where crude reds and greens and blues have been pitilessly daubed in staring contrast over stone or wood, we can hardly be surprised at the Dean and Chapter feeling some apprehensions of the effect of turning a decorator into their choir. But there are artists to whose hands so delicate and difficult a work might be entrusted with confidence as to the result. Anyhow we can afford to wait. Let nothing be done rashly, to be repented of when it is too late. Better keep up Tenison's paneling, which, with Grinling Gibbons's carving, is so good in itself that we shall part with it with regret, than replace it with modern arrangements for which there is no authority.

Space forbids our saying anything of Mr. Parker's lucid exposition of the monastic buildings, based necessarily on Professor Willis's work, in which he was assisted by Precentor Venables. We would only express a hope that the undercroft of the Prior's chapel, till lately the Library, may be faithfully restored. The reproduction of the central row of piers with the double range of groining will not be an inexpensive work, but it will be a most beautiful one, nor do we see that any other course is practicable.

We have left ourselves no room for more than the barest mention of the excursions. These were well arranged, and included most of the chief objects of antiquarian interest in East Kent. Chilham Castle and Chartham Church; the grey walls of the Roman fortress of Richborough, with its archaeological "crux" in the centre of its area; Sandwich, with its walls, gates, and churches, so singular in plan and design, not forgetting the exquisite little Early English hospital chapel of St. Bartholomew; the grand cruciform church of Minster, with its vaulted chancel and transepts; the Roman station of Lympne, "Portus Lemanis," where the Institute was met by the veteran antiquary, Mr. Roach Smith; Saltwood Castle, with its stately Richard III. gateway; Hythe, with its fine Early English chancel and mysterious pile of skulls and bones; the remarkable church at Lyminge, containing remains of the Romano-British Basilica, were successively visited, and the meeting closed with a pleasant and instructive visit to Dover, in conjunction with the Kentish Archaeological Society, where the interesting primæval church and Roman pharos, so admirably restored by Sir Gilbert Scott, were expounded by Mr. Parker, and the Castle, by the first authority on military architecture, Mr. G. T. Clark. The sketch of the history of military architecture in England from times anterior to the arrival of the Romans, carried down through Roman, Saxon, and Norman times, to the latest developments in the great Edwardian and Lancastrian castles, was a masterly discourse. It is a pity that it was spoken, not written, and is not therefore likely to appear among the records of this meeting. It may be hoped, however, that Mr. Clark will give us before long his promised history of this branch of architecture in England. The Norman castle at Colchester, which is to be the place of meeting in 1876, and the adjacent fortress of Hedingham, will afford Mr. Clark suitable themes.

DRESSMAKING AS A FINE ART.

WITHIN the last few years there has been a great revival in many minor branches of decorative art. The school of needlework at South Kensington is rich in designs for costly and beautiful hangings. There are a large number of efficient workers employed there, and some of the embroidery produced by the ladies is extremely good. In many shop windows are to be seen fine plaques of china and admirable tiles, while even the convicts at Woking turn out very creditable mosaic. Wall papers have reached the point of being really decorative, and the most fastidious person can hardly fail to find something to please him amongst the many patterns brought out by competent people who have studied the subject. It is now possible to get both men and women so well educated in art and archaeology that they are able to design appropriate furniture to suit any given style of architecture. It is surely time to try art dressmaking. So long as we were contented to follow French fashions with regard to the furnishing of our houses it was perhaps natural that our wives and daughters should get their dresses from Paris. Now that we have ceased to look across the Channel for the patterns of our carpets and our clocks, there is no reason why dress should not also be provided at home in harmony with other decorations. When we walk into a drawing-room furnished in severe "Queen Anne," and find the lady of the house sitting in an upright chair, sipping her tea out of a Bristol cup and saucer, but dressed in the extreme of the present fashion, our æsthetic teeth are set on edge. Everything seems out of tune and inharmonious. It is as if

we opened a Venetian casket and found that it contained a photograph of the Albert Memorial. Ladies with delicate perception and sufficient skill to know how to furnish their rooms feel this incongruity instinctively. They often express a wish that they could order their dresses from the same artist who paints their rooms; but as that is impossible, they go to Mr. Worth instead, and try to conform their taste to the last new Paris whim, no matter how ugly or indecorous it may be. The fashions which have been worn for the last six or seven years are certainly much more picturesque than those of the days of crinoline. More care has been taken by the milliners that colours shall be few and harmonious. The wearing of black even by those not in mourning has been very generally adopted, and, as it suits almost every one, and looks well out of doors, it is at least unobjectionable. Still there is an immense amount of bad dressing to be seen everywhere which is quite needless, and which would be simply impossible if the art was at all understood by either dressmakers or dress wearers.

Dressmakers, as a class, are vulgar and uneducated, with little appreciation of the artistic subtleties of their art, or even its more obvious proprieties. They have learnt to load their work with ugly and senseless frills which do not end anything, with bows which do not tie anything, and with buttons which are of no use, until their eyes are incapable of seeing, or their minds of understanding, the grace of simplicity and the charm of suitability. Of what constitutes true beauty in the female form they are entirely ignorant, and they adore a waist that can be spanned. They think that a dress is a perfect fit in which a lady can neither raise her arms nor use her legs. Artificial flowers and glass beads are their highest ideal of decoration, and costly trimmings of art. A novelty, however ugly, if stamped with the approval of Paris, is accepted without a thought, but the suggestion of some pretty design which has not emanated from that centre of frivolity is at once rejected with scorn because it has no "style." It is not uncommon to see vigorous efforts made on the part of some ladies to emancipate themselves from the thrall of fashion and to strike out a line for themselves. Too often these efforts are signal failures from want of sufficient knowledge of the subject. There are very few people who have a genius for dressing themselves or even the perception to know what style suits them best. Ignorant attempts at the picturesque are often much worse than even a servile imitation of the reigning fashion. A good design is spoiled when badly carried out, or when the workmanship is not highly finished. Laces of different periods and countries are often ignorantly mixed up together, and sleeves of one century worn with bodices of another. It is unpleasant to see a Stuart costume surmounted by a Victorian chignon or an Elizabethan head-dress finished with a mob cap. Some ladies too will appear in a mediæval dress one day and in a Pompadour robe the next, giving one the impression that they are using up their fancy ball costumes. Every woman has a certain style of appearance, and her dress should correspond with it. In French fashions there is generally a great want of dignity—the dignity of simplicity. How refreshing it is to see a handsome young woman in a plain gown looking, as George Eliot describes Dorothea Brooke, like a "fine quotation from the Bible in to-day's newspaper!"

Some time ago a "Country Critic" expressed in the pages of the *Cornhill Magazine* his bewilderment after having made a tour through the studios of a certain class of painters. His politeness and old-fashioned courtesy probably prevented him from remarking upon what no doubt also struck him with astonishment—the withered appearance of the dresses of the ladies who belong to the set of whom he speaks. They too say, "Give us roses, but let them be faded ones." They sometimes unfortunately go further and say, "Let them be soiled ones." To a country gentleman accustomed to see his womenfolk in fresh muslins and clean prints it is not a little surprising to be taken to the homes of some of the literary and semi-artistic families living in and near London. An atmosphere of mouldy decay pervades the house, which is painted in dark green blues. The walls are hung with every conceivable absurdity—seances where no candles are ever lighted, gongs which are not to sound, curtains which have no purpose and give the air of an old clothes shop. Whole dinner services of china are strung on the staircase, and everything is covered thick with a black oily dust made by smoke, smuts, and fog. Perhaps one of the sons of the house has taken to painting as a profession, and brings his studio friends home with him. His sisters hear a constant jargon about the beauty of "tone," which they gradually discover to consist in old age with a judicious addition of dirt. They see their brother and his friends go into ecstasies over pieces of stuff which they pick out of the rubbish of a neighbouring pawnbroker. Consequently, the poor girls try to dress in a way which they fondly believe to be artistic, and end in looking like rag dolls. They tie the refuse of Cairo round their waists, and wisps of strange fabrics round their necks. Peacock's feathers eye us from unaccountable situations, and frills of old lace, so dirty as to be almost nasty, garnish throats which would look much better in clean linen collars. But clean linen collars and cuffs have unfortunately no tone; they are incompatible with artistic dressing. Then, too, tidy hair is inadmissible. It should give the impression that it is subject to being torn whenever its owner is carried away by the tumult of feeling produced by a passionate poem of Rossetti's or the tragic ending of a three-volume novel. It must never be fastened up securely, but must

be ready to fall down at the slightest provocation. It must be free to the four winds of heaven, and look like well-tossed hay. There is another style of artistic dressing which, when badly done, is almost as offensive as the withered style. We may call it, for want of a better name, Free Classic. It is generally adopted by short fat people with high shoulders. It consists for the most part of a shapeless cream-coloured cotton or woollen robe, with a gold girdle. On stout figures the effect is by no means attractive. A model attired in a night-gown which has been properly damped and draped no doubt looks very well, but a night-gown over a reasonable amount of under-garments is merely ungainly and shapeless. Dresses of this pattern must be either ugly or indelicate. Still, freedom to live as we like and dress as we like is such a desirable thing that we may rejoice to think a lady can go to a dinner-party in a white flannel dressing-gown without any doubts being raised as to her sanity. Indeed, we must be glad of every nail that can be put in Mrs. Grundy's coffin. It is opening up a way for the varieties of individuality which she so sternly represses in any one under the rank of a countess. The sort of dressing, however, we have been speaking of unhappily often only retards freedom. It bears the same relationship to really artistic costume that the tawdry imitations of litter-shops in back streets bear to first-rate French fashions. Good artistic and good fashionable dressing both involve expense, and neither of them can be well carried out without thought, knowledge, and money. We are very unfortunate in having no national costume. It would save us from much that is unbearably hideous in the dress of the lower orders, and perhaps enable them to have clean, serviceable clothing, instead of trumpery second-hand finery. If our middle-class young ladies are to do cooking and housemaid's work they, too, should have a picturesque costume. Perhaps the authorities at South Kensington might spend some of their spare time in designing suitable combinations of short, bright petticoats, and overskirts to be drawn through a hanging girdle or the old-fashioned pocket-holes of our great-grandmothers.

Women should either adopt a uniform as men have done, or else dressmaking should be elevated into the position of a fine art, and treated as such. It should be undertaken by people of culture and refinement in the same way that cookery has been. There ought to be a school of art dressmaking. Perhaps a Royal Princess would patronize it. Certainly, portrait-painters would be only too glad to know of a place at which their sitters could be becomingly got up. It is melancholy to see the bad millinery which is being perpetuated in pictures, and which will be an eyesore to future generations. The walls of the Royal Academy are every year hung with portraits which look like enlarged copies from *Le Pollet* or the *Queen* newspaper. Ladies can never see ugliness in a dress so long as it is made in the height of the reigning fashion. They have their portraits taken, if possible, in "the last new thing," and then, when another style appears, wonder they could ever have made such frights of themselves. If there were some recognized rules about dressing, as there are about almost every other kind of decoration, in time they would be followed, to the great relief of people of taste, and to the comfort of people with no taste at all. There are always a large number of ladies who say they have got no work to do. Here is an opening for them. Their first step ought to be to petition Her Majesty not to insist upon ladies who are delicate or spare in figure wearing low dresses at morning drawing-rooms. Their second one ought to be to abolish the use of the word "fashionable" in its present sense, and to substitute for it the word "becoming," which would indicate both economy where it is necessary and magnificence where it is suitable.

THE "CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION."

ALTHOUGH we should be sorry to throw discouragement on the American International Exhibition of next year, it is impossible not to notice the dangerous assumption that what is called the Memorial Hall is fire-proof. An account of the preparations for the Exhibition lately published in the *Times* states that this Memorial Hall "is designed to stand for all time; is a fire-proof structure of granite and brick, and will be the Art Gallery of the Exhibition." The writer is evidently possessed with that mischievous delusion which so widely prevails in England. "Being designed for an absolutely fire-proof structure," he says, "nothing combustible is used"; and he adds that the dome, 150 feet high, is of glass and iron, of unique design. It was inevitable that the Americans should erect on this occasion a big building of glass and iron, and such a building is fire-proof in this sense, that the iron work of the dome will not burn, but only bend in intense heat. The danger of all such buildings is, that they are made receptacles of combustible materials, and when these burn the building tumbles down. Assuming that all possible precautions against fire will be taken, the building will still be far from "absolutely fire-proof." Perhaps a large building could correctly be thus described, and certainly not such a building as this Memorial Hall.

A building that has a dome 150 feet high must of course be made the subject of correspondingly elevated writing. After mentioning all the energetic gentlemen who form Committees for this work, the correspondent of the *Times* tells us that "their zealous activity in the perfection of a complete plan will result in the success that the people of the United States now regard as assured." The people of the United States are supreme judges of this matter, and

it may be safely asserted that, if they are pleased, nobody else can effectively find fault. The United States contain a population of 45,000,000, and it is estimated that one-tenth of this population will visit the Exhibition, and thousands will visit it over and over again. The calculation of 10,000,000 admissions during the whole period of the Exhibition is apparently not excessive. The people are fond of travelling, have money, and like to spend it. If only it be the fashion to go to the Exhibition everybody will go, and if the energetic Committees know how to make a fashion, and are taking the proper means, all will be well. But in the view of the Correspondent success in this point is assured. "It will be the fashion to go to the Exhibition just as it is to flee to the seaside or the mountains in Midsummer." In his enthusiasm he forgets that an Exhibition, even combined with a centennial celebration, is not exactly what doctors call a health resort. The centre upon which 5,000,000 of people are moving would hardly be selected as specially salubrious. But if oratory can serve instead of fresh air, there will be plenty of it. We fully agree that the British Government did right in responding cordially to the invitation to take part in this Exhibition, although we are so defective in enthusiasm as to doubt whether it will have much influence on the American Protective tariff. At this moment the inhabitants of New York and Boston prefer or submit to consume coal raised in the United States rather than import cheaper coal from Nova Scotia. No Exhibition can teach them more on this point than they know already. Nevertheless, we are told that a great desire for British fabrics in every line of manufacture exists in America, and we should be happy to believe it. The Duke of Richmond, K.G., as Lord President of the Queen's Council, has taken a part in these preparations, which, we are told, has given great satisfaction throughout America, and if a duly and decorated representative of this country would be acceptable as an "official delegate," it is probable that Mr. Disraeli could supply one. We feel, however, that a residence of some months at Philadelphia in the midst of all the orating and perorating that will be evoked by the "Centennial Exposition" would be a service demanding much patience and self-devotion in those who undertake it. The best feature of these centennial celebrations is that they tend to reconcile North and South, and we have no doubt that on this account the representatives of our own and other nations will listen good-humouredly to a large quantity of tall talk. Still, there are limits to human endurance, and if the talk is to be as big as the buildings of the Exhibition, and as ceaseless as the flow of visitors, the only resource of the foreign visitors will be to go to sleep under it. The most alarming symptom of the prevailing frenzy is the formation of a "Centennial Association" at New York, where, as the Royal army was in possession almost throughout the war, we had hoped there might be nothing to commemorate. It is true that on the Bowling Green in New York there stood a leaden statue of King George III. which in July 1776 was prostrated by a mob, who, if this statue was like some other statues of our Kings, deserved the thanks of posterity for destroying it. The actors in this proceeding were fond of boasting that 42,000 bullets were made out of King George's statue to shoot King George's soldiers. But, with this exception, New York was tranquil until General Howe's army entered it a few weeks afterwards; and as this city, for various reasons, was more loyal than any other part of the revolted colonies, we may venture to assume that the occupation was not generally unwelcome. At any rate, the orderly rule of a military Governor rendered any further display of patriotism impracticable. It may be freely admitted that the defeats of American troops in the vicinity of New York were not dishonourable, and that the victories of General Howe lost much of their effect by his want of energy in following them up. But we do not see in the events of 1776 much material for patriotic oratory, and if too much is said about the uprising of a united people, we might be tempted to quote from an American historian the remonstrance of certain New York Militiamen in Washington's camp against further fighting:—"They were offered," they said, "peace, liberty, and safety; and what more could they ask?"

However, it appears that many of the leading citizens of New York are determined, "without any regard to outlay or time," to make the occasion memorable. It is designed particularly to bring forward the school children in order that their minds may be imbued with the patriotic sentiments that stirred the men who fought for American independence. We must allow that, if America has not much history, she makes the most of what she has. If the bodies of the school children are supplied with tea and cake, their minds will no doubt be properly receptive of patriotic sentiments. At a meeting adequately organized we should not wonder if the fact of the British occupation of New York could be wholly forgotten and the loyal disposition of its inhabitants put out of mind. By fresh portrayals of the characters and deeds of the noble men of 1776, by public tributes in their honour, by reviewing the political systems which they established, it is hoped that the old spirit of patriotism may be revived and perpetuated. Such is the programme of the Association, and we think it highly probable that there will be as much patriotism in New York next year as there was in 1776. In the life of Major-General John Sullivan, published at Boston a few years ago, a discussion occurs as to the battle of Long Island, in which he took part, and the expediency of defending New York, and as a reason to the contrary it is stated that "The inhabitants were loyalists, many of them in the British camp." We are not quite sure whether the statement refers to Long Island or to the city of New York, but that is not

very important. In case any enthusiastic centennialist should arrive at such a point of fervour as to assert that all the New Yorkers of 1776 were patriots, it is to be hoped that this statement of a native writer will be borne in mind. Another and even stronger testimony to the same effect is furnished by the fact that in the winter of 1779 the British Governor of New York resolved to arm the inhabitants in aid of the regular garrison, and in a few hours he had 4,300 loyal volunteers under his orders.

It would of course be open to New York to celebrate the day when the British army left it, but a centennial on that account will not be due for several years, and we should think that long before it arrives the fire of patriotism will have burnt itself out. Incessant repetition of speeches on the same subject will tire even the most sympathetic audiences, and, in spite of the vigorous assertion that all the men of 1776 were great and good, it will begin at last to be perceived that the intellectual stature of some was moderate, and the motives of some were selfish. It is perhaps rather hard upon America that her heroic age should be so exposed to sceptical inquiry. There are, however, thirty-eight States which will, or may, contribute to the Exhibition, and only thirteen of them have any revolutionary memories at all. That, at any rate, is some mitigation of the "eloquential" prospect. The Governor of South Carolina expresses the interest of its people in the Exhibition, confessing at the same time that they have not yet done anything towards making a creditable exhibition of the products of their State. Some of the most famous battle-grounds of the Revolutionary War lie in South Carolina; she cannot send these to the Exhibition, and from well-known causes she has little else to send. The Governor of this State has written a letter on this subject to the *New York Herald*, and we learn from it that the centennial of Lexington has awakened in the people of South Carolina a desire to join in the "great reunion at Philadelphia." It is pleasant to note these symptoms that a large and cheerful family party is likely to meet next year, and we only wish the managers to bear in mind that strangers are apt to find such a party dull. If by any means the centennial business could be separated from the proper work of the Exhibition, it might be convenient, for although this sort of thing has been done near to death, a collection of the products of all America is likely to be more interesting to visitors than the proceedings of what may be called a mutual admiration society of Americans. Let the natives tell one another that their fathers were very fine fellows and have very fine sons, but do not compel foreigners to listen. It would be a pity if Washington should become a bore, and centennials a nuisance, but that will be the end if things go on as they have begun.

THE QUEEN ANNE CRAZE.

WHEN we complained a short time since of the absence of any real Architectural Exhibition in London, we did not think it necessary to refer to that most substantial one which a man with good legs and an enthusiastic temper may make for himself if he has wind and pluck to bestride uncounted miles of flagging. We shall now offer some remarks upon a new fashion in house-building, as to which the drawings at the Royal Academy and some rather conspicuous recent productions of our metropolitan architects illustrate each other.

Every educated gazer who takes a sympathetic interest in the characteristics of rural England must have been often struck with the comfortable dignity of those square-cast mellow residences of burgess squires and opulent old maids, standing back, in the homely comeliness of honest red brick, in the high streets of country towns, with their coped enclosure walls, and ball-topped gateways, their prim grass plots leading up to the shell-topped front door, their narrow windows darkened with casements, the heaviness of whose framing is set out by dingy white paint, and their well-moulded cornices capped by a visible lichened roof. Nobody, however, we venture to say, dreamed till seven or eight years since that a school of clever and learned architects would arise in England who could raise that class of house into an ideal and a point of departure for a new style. The surprise of the man, who may be supposed to have heard this from the spirits, would have turned to bewilderment if he had further learned that the leaders of the movement were schismatics from the Gothic church. We know very well that some of these ingenious gentlemen are ready to prove that their pet style is "free classical"; but we can only treat the assumption as a solemn joke. All in it which they cling to, good or bad—the honest use of red brick, the frequent resort to something like window tracery, the indulgence in constructional decoration, and in particular the adoption of the conspicuous and pyramiding, though too often tortured, sky line, of solid chimney, massive dormer, and fantastical gable—which does not truly belong to the real horizontal "Queen Anne"—are all of them principles of Gothic composition, often indeed found in the post-Gothic styles, but holding their places there as the relics of the former and not the introduction of the newer method. To take the prosaic comeliness of a Queen Anne house in some dull suburb, and then to trick it out with gables from Amsterdam, tile-facings from Kent, chimneys from Essex, and agrafting from Italy, is only to begin again at a disadvantage, and in an artificial way, to build up those principles of elastic architectural composition which centuries of healthy progress had naturally developed to the architect's hand in the recognized phases of the older national style.

The truth is that the apostles of Queen Anne architecture have not yet agreed upon any consistent symbol of their own faith. No more, they may answer, have the preachers of Gothic. What has the Perpendicular of Pugin or the Flowing of Carpenter to do with the Early French of Mr. Burges, the Venetian of Woodward, or the occasional raids into Italy and Germany of Sir Gilbert Scott? The answer to this *tu quoque* is very simple. The advocates of Gothic based their claim for a candid hearing upon their appeal to four centuries and almost all civilized Europe, and they had not the pretension of deciding whether there would ultimately be one Gothic of the future or the free development and adaptation of unreckoned national and chronological varieties. The Queen-Annists take the narrowest possible standing ground in the accidental results of a single short reign in a single country of Europe, and then dream of expanding indefinitely from that centre. They mean to build another pyramid, but they propose to rear it on its apex. Accordingly, Queen Anne in the hands of its most convinced votaries, Messrs. Stevenson and Robson, is the genuine article, narrow windows, heavy white casements, and all. When it is undertaken by Mr. T. H. Wyatt, the only elder representative of architecture who has coquetted with the fashion, it represents, as in his houses in Park Lane, Upper Berkeley Street, and Birdcage Walk, some substantial opulent-looking mansion of the conventional London-Italian form, with sash windows and plate-glass, but with the healthy substitution of red brick for drab cement, and the superposition of a sky line which may be a gable from Amsterdam or a tourelle from France. But when we come to the light-hearted Gothicians who flirt with Duessa without abandoning hopes of a reconciliation with their forgiving Una, we find that they merely embody in concrete structures a phenomenon which every writer on the Gothic revival, and every tourist who has tramped Europe with eyes in his head, have appreciated from the first moment of intelligent discrimination. They have simply yielded their judgment captive to the multitudinous seductions of the Gothic afterglow, that remanet of traditional forms and ideas, which in variously incongruous combinations with the new-old learning, covered Europe, continental and insular, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with buildings as attractive to the painter as they ought to be suggestive of caution to the architect. We may afford to smile at the humorous assurance which tickets this unchecked search after eclectic picturesqueness with the name of good Queen Anne, but we cannot help realizing that Mr. Bodley's offices for the London School Board on the Thames Embankment recalls nothing with which Addison or Harley would have been familiar, while they suggest strong reminiscences of that capriciously attractive offspring of the early seventeenth century, the Butter Market at Haarlem.

Mr. Norman Shaw, fond as he may be of toying with Elizabethan and Jacobean prettinesses, only succeeds in proving that his real heart's affections are fixed on the indigenous Tudor, the accommodation of which in his hands to living wants has made the national art of the present day his debtor. His New Zealand Chambers in Leadenhall Street prove our assertion, while Lowther Lodge, so unluckily overshadowed by the big Albert Hall, is intrinsically a Tudor manor-house in the country into which some unassimilative features of an alien style have been wilfully inserted without succeeding in spoiling the picturesqueness which it owes to its dominant character. His neighbouring house in Queen's Gate, Kensington (994 of the Academy Catalogue), as represented in Burlington House, is a clever adaptation of a town mansion such as a prosperous merchant of James I.'s time might have constructed at Aldersgate or Bishopsgate, with gabling well pyramided, the front boldly divided by horizontal pilaster strips, graceful recessed galleries, a semi-circular projecting balcony, and the doorway boldly thrown back under an arch. The windows are filled with rectangular tracery, relieved (as often occurs at the date) by a wide centre light with semicircular head in the lower range. The building itself is, however, sufficiently near completion to allow of comparison, and we must say that the performance lags behind the intention. The scale is too pinched, the pilaster strips want emphasis, and the tracery, which is of wood, is too thin. A few more steps westward brings us to Palace Gate, where a house has been at least externally completed in the most rigorous so-called Queen Anne, by Messrs. Stevenson and Robson (983). The sky line here is thoroughly Dutch, while the red and light bricks are well contrasted in the construction. But the narrow windows, with their light-excluding casements, conspicuous in white lead, are a note very difficult to be wiped out, of an artificial and scholastic revival. Still, this composition contrasts favourably with one across the same street, bearing the date of 1870, in which a "Queen Anne" outline is matched with rectangular tracery of heavy square unchanfered stone bars, brick ornamentation over the windows recalling the fantastical pediments which cabinet-makers of the last century placed upon bureaux to carry plaster busts, and an Italian Gothic cornice.

In contrast to the private house of their design, Messrs. Stevenson and Robson's London Board School (102) proves that so-called Queen Anne may be turned to practical convenience where broad window spaces are needed. Why should these be less desirable where the comfort of a London resident is in question? Mr. Calcott in his alterations to an old front in Fleet Street (960) produces a pleasing architectural character by the simple addition of three well-proportioned hipped dormers. Mr. Gosling's premises for Mr. Maw in Aldersgate Street (22) are in fact in

watered-down Elizabethan. Mr. Emden stands clear out of the current, for he is rebuilding the Piccadilly front of St. James's Hall in Italian Gothic (1019). Mr. Young, in his Haseley Manor, near Warwick, keeps pretty close to the Tudor idea, while Messrs. Belcher's clever Hall and Warehouses for the Curriers' Company in London Wall (1022) reproduce the characteristic brick Gothic of a northern German town, of which the Dutch gabled mansion is the capricious descendant. Mr. Beazley's house at Westgate-on-Sea (1011) affects a half-timbered construction which would be appropriate in the Weald, but is surely out of place in dreary, treeless Thanet.

After all we may be asked why between taking this or that phase of modern Pointed, and this or that phase of modern "Queen Anne," we pass the one and remand the other. We have no hesitation in replying that in accepting—without attempting to balance—a painter's picturesqueness as characterizing both treatments, we are able in one case to discover a law of appropriate detail and ornament, and that we miss such a test in the other. Of a new Gothic building we can say, that the outline is good but the detail is clumsy, or thin, or incongruous, or an anachronism, or that with excellent detail the mass fails, or perhaps that both qualities should be marked as it may be with a plus or a minus sign. In "Queen Anne" there is no such criterion. Natural selection may in the reign of some Anne II. or Anne III. have paired off mass and detail, but at present the practice of the new method is merely the proclamation on the architect's part that in his treatment of the elements of his structure his own fancy shall be without appeal his referee.

On the whole, we take our leave of the Queen Anne craze in perfect good humour and with equal scepticism. It is an incident in the general revolt against the plenary inspiration of Vitruvius and the worship of the five orders and the cornice, of which the Gothic movement exhibits the most perfect development, and it contains a germ of truth, inasmuch as it places adaptation of detail as an essential of the style of the future. But it fails completely in the hopeless task of showing that the high road of freedom lies along the short path strewn with the scanty and inconsistent repertory at the command of an English master builder between 1660 and 1714, even if enriched with the more exuberant resources of his Dutch brother of an earlier half-century.

It will have given innocent amusement to several able architects and elicited animated conversation from their enthusiastic supporters, and it will have played a not inconspicuous part in the rapid transformation of the grim stale London of our youth into a city in which the infinite variety of elevation, of sky-line, of material, and of detail, will in conspicuous disproportion to the value of each constituent part result in a big whole of bewildering picturesqueness. But the history of the Queen Anne propaganda as the serious and scientific development of a successful national style out of an existing English type will have been written on water.

ANOTHER MUDDLE.

IT is sometimes said that imprisonment for debt has been abolished by an Act of 1869, and when it is answered that debtors are still imprisoned, the reply is that this is for contempt of court. An example of—we will not say the working, but the abuse—of the Act of 1869 has been lately brought before the House of Commons, and it would seem that one at least of the County Court Judges believed his power of imprisonment for contempt to be unlimited. It appears that William Smallbone was defendant in a suit in equity instituted in a County Court by his brother's widow and devisee to compel him to convey upon the trusts of his brother's will a certain small property purchased from Smallbone by his brother and paid for, but which had not been conveyed, though possession had been given. Smallbone not only defended the suit, but prosecuted an action of ejectment for the recovery of the land from his brother's widow. The decision, which was given in April 1874, was adverse to Smallbone; he was decreed to convey the land and pay the plaintiff's costs. He conveyed the land, but, not having paid the costs, he was summoned in September to show cause why he should not be committed for contempt, and on the 16th of that month he appeared and stated that he was about to sell some property out of the produce of which he intended to pay the costs. The Judge found him guilty of contempt, but in consequence of his statement directed that the warrant for his committal should not be executed if within one month he paid 30*l.* and the balance within two months. Not having paid any portion of the costs, he was on the 30th of October committed to Winchester Gaol. In February he applied, through his solicitor, to the Judge for his discharge on the grounds of ill health and inability to pay, and it was then admitted that the property which he had expressed his intention to sell, though worth 300*l.*, had been sold to his brother for 200*l.*, out of which 100*l.* was retained by his brother for an alleged debt, and 80*l.* was paid to the defendant's solicitor in discharge of the defendant's own costs. The Judge thereupon adjourned the hearing of the application, to enable the defendant to make some reasonable offer; but none being made, Smallbone remained in prison until the 2nd of this month, when he was discharged by order of Baron Huddleston. Thus far the facts are undisputed, and whereas the power of imprisonment under the Act of 1869 is limited to six weeks, it appears that Small-

bone was imprisoned from the 30th of October to the 2nd of July.

A question upon this case was put to the Attorney-General in the House of Commons by Mr. C. Lewis on Thursday in last week, and it must be confessed that Sir Richard Bagge, instructed by "a gentleman connected with the Legal Department of the Treasury and of great experience," made an extraordinary muddle of his answer. It is not to be expected that the Attorney-General or anybody else should know all the law. Heaven forbid that, as a learned Judge once said at *Nisi Prius*. But a Law Officer of the Crown usually possesses that practical knowledge which enables him—to use a vulgar phrase—to smell a rat. The Attorney-General, however, failed to perceive that the gentleman of great experience from the Legal Department of the Treasury was putting into his mouth an absurd statement. He was made to say that Baron Huddleston discharged Smallbone, "on the ground of his age, ill-health, and inability to pay," and Baron Huddleston, although we may suppose he would stand a good deal from the Government which made him a Judge, could not quite stand such an official stultification as that. "Such," said the Attorney-General, "as I am informed, are the facts of the case," and he felt bound, in his opinion, to add that Smallbone's imprisonment was contrary to law. This was the unkindest cut of all. He had taken the trouble to think about the case, and yet it had not occurred to him as improbable or unlikely that Baron Huddleston would mistake the law. "All parties concerned, Judge [of County Court], Registrar, counsel, and solicitors, were apparently forgetful of the provisions of the Debtors' Act of 1869"; and it might be added that the Attorney-General himself only imperfectly remembered them. "It is still more strange," he said, "that the mistake which had been made was not discovered when the parties were before Baron Huddleston, as the defendant was not discharged from prison on the ground of any illegality or irregularity in his committal, but upon grounds which were quite consistent with its perfect legality and regularity." Very strange indeed, if true, and strange that the Attorney-General should think that possibly it might be true. It was not Baron Huddleston's enemy that had done this, but his own familiar friend. They had taken sweet counsel together—all the sweeter because their fees were paid by Government—and they had sat together on the Treasury Bench and voted in the same lobby. No wonder Baron Huddleston was angry, especially as the offence is such as no explanation or apology can repair. The Attorney-General, we may believe, was simply thoughtless, and until the fusion of law and equity is very complete, we must be prepared to find that lawyers only know thoroughly the branch of law in which they habitually practise. But the experienced legal gentleman from the Treasury has allowed it to appear that he thought a Baron of the Exchequer capable of a gross blunder in a matter which he was particularly bound to understand. The Judges of the Superior Courts are specially charged with the duty of guarding the liberty of the subject, and when they find a man imprisoned without any colour of right, they ought immediately to discharge him, not because he is old or sick, but because he is entitled to his freedom. As might be expected, the Attorney-General found himself under the necessity of inviting the attention of the House of Commons on Monday last, while he stated to them the substance of a letter which he had received from Baron Huddleston. That learned Judge appeared to consider—and not unnaturally—that the answer of the Attorney-General to Mr. C. Lewis unfairly reflected on him, and that the statement of facts contained in that answer was essentially inaccurate. He appeared to be under the impression, which we must say is not surprising, that the Attorney-General had charged him with forgetfulness of the Debtors' Act of 1869. The Attorney-General explains that his observation that "the mistake was not discovered when the parties were before Baron Huddleston" had reference to the legal advisers of Smallbone and not to the Judge. But this is only saying that the Attorney-General does not expect much from Judges generally, and without special reference to Baron Huddleston. If Mr. Gladstone finds out that the Judges are not required to be "posted" in the Debtors' Act of 1869, he will certainly propose to cut down their salaries. The legal advisers of Smallbone would be rather a poor lot if they could not find out that he was entitled to his discharge as matter of right, but the Attorney-General seems to consider it quite possible that they groped for a long time among the clauses of the Act before arriving, with the help of the Judge, at this conclusion. According to the information afforded to the Attorney-General, they asked for his discharge, not upon the ground that the order for his committal was illegal, but that he was an old man, ill, and unable to pay. If experienced legal gentlemen at the Treasury are able to believe such fables, we almost wonder that the "Claimant" was not, after all, too much for them. We say nothing about Judges or Law Officers of the Crown, but if an attorney does not know his business, it is likely to be bad for him.

The Attorney-General correctly reminded the House that this subject was not under his cognizance, that the County Court Judges are not responsible to him, and that he possesses no means of investigating any cases of alleged mistake on their part. But it is assumed that in some way Government supervises the proceedings of Judges, and it appears natural to put any questions relating to their conduct either to the Home Secretary or to the Attorney-General in the House of Commons, and to the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords. It is remarkable that, although

these three officers are supposed to manage amongst them the duties which would properly belong to a Minister of Justice, yet only one of them has any office for the purpose. When the Lord Chancellor lately called upon a Coroner for an explanation of his conduct, his secretary wrote from the Lord Chancellor's private house, just as he would if he had been asking the Coroner to dinner. The Attorney-General does his business of all kinds, public and private, at his own chambers. It is, in fact, the duty of nobody in particular to answer such questions as those of Mr. C. Lewis, and this accounts for the slovenly manner in which they are often answered. If Sir Richard Baggallay were to be appointed a Baron of the Exchequer, he would no doubt read up the Debtors' Act of 1869, and avoid any glaring mistakes in dealing with a case under it. He ought to have remembered that Baron Huddleston would be likely to do the same. Unfortunately he has let the world see that an Attorney-General thinks a Judge capable of an absurdity, or at least does not regard such absurdity as violently improbable. The Act of 1869 empowers any Court to commit to prison "for a term not exceeding six weeks, or until payment of the sum due," any person who makes default in payment of any debt or instalment of any debt due from him in pursuance of any order or judgment of any Court. But this power shall only be exercised where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the person making default has means to pay and has refused. Subject to this and other exceptions, which for our present purpose are immaterial, no person shall, after the commencement of the Act, be arrested or imprisoned for making default in payment of a sum of money. As Mr. C. Lewis has given notice of further questions on the subject, we shall perhaps obtain some elucidation of the mental process by which the County Court Judge arrived at the conclusion that he might lock up Smallbone without limit. A Bill is pending in the House of Commons by which County Court Judges would be deprived of the power to make orders for committal; but probably this Bill will be involved in the same doom as other and more important measures. To provide that the power shall only be exercised by Judges of the Supreme Court would go nearly to abolish it. At present it is pretty largely exercised by Judges of County Courts, and if it is discreetly exercised, it should be beneficial. People who can pay and won't pay must be made to pay. That, we presume, was the principle of the Act, and we do not quite see why it should be superseded. The Judge summons the debtor before him and examines him as to his means of payment, and makes, or ought to make, an order for payment, by instalments or otherwise, according to the debtor's means. One of the earliest cases on this Act occurred in the Court of Chancery, and the present Lord Justice James, then a Vice-Chancellor, said, "It has been sworn that these defendants are in receipt of good salaries. They have had the opportunity of filing an affidavit in answer, and have not done so." He made an order for payment of a sum of 31*l.* due for costs by instalments of 1*l.* per month, and in default of payment the plaintiff might apply for a committal. That seems a reasonable order, and such as a County Court Judge might be competent to make. Of course, if the sentimental view is to prevail, the Act will be repealed or largely modified. But we venture to think it sound policy to make people pay their debts, if possible. Even an old man in weak health is capable of honesty.

METROPOLITAN STREETS AND ROADS.

A COMMITTEE of the Society of Arts has made a Report on Street Paving and Cleansing, and, whatever be the value of its conclusions, we must allow that it has conducted an interesting inquiry. The surface dirt of the streets is found to consist chiefly of horse-dung combined with abraded granite and iron. It has been calculated that 1,000 tons of horse-dung are deposited daily in the streets of the metropolis. A great part of the filth accumulated on the skin must, therefore, be pulverized refuse of this kind. The domestic fire acts as a pump which draws in the air of the street, and with it the filth of the street for deposit on the person, clothes, and furniture. The estimated washing-bill of the metropolis is upwards of 5,000,000*l.* per annum. Coal soot is undoubtedly contributory to skin-dirt, but no great difference is observed in the filth of children in winter as compared with summer. People who are nice in the air they breathe as well as in personal cleanliness are advised to let as little as possible of street air enter their houses except through screens of wire gauze. Various contrivances are, as we know, adopted to screen air and wash it for the use of Parliament. In addition to the evil arising from dust, mischief is caused by emanations from matter absorbed between the stones; and the result is that sanitary science demands "impermeability of street covering," which, as we find further on, the authors of the Report consider can be best obtained by asphalt. They approve, however, a recommendation urged by Lord Palmerston and others, to provide smooth tracks for wheels distinct from the provision for the track and foothold of the horses. This distinct provision has long existed in the cities of Northern Italy, and it exists also in the Commercial Road at the East-end of London, and in some narrow streets in the City. It is estimated that the tractive force required for transit would be reduced by one-half by adopting stone tramways, and thus there would be a reduction of half the dirt and dust of the streets. These stone tramways may be, and are, used both when the rest of the

street is paved with granite and when it is macadamized. It would appear that the further extension of this system would be a distinct benefit. Another valuable idea is that of depending for street cleansing on washing rather than on sweeping. But it seems to be admitted that unctuous and adhesive mud, such as that of London, would require the street-sweeping machine. We should think, too, that the use of powerful jets of water supposes the streets to be deserted more completely than is often the case in London. It also supposes water to be abundant and cheap; but if the same water be used for this as for domestic purposes, that supposition might be questionable. For this purpose Thames water unfiltered would be suitable, but that water is not generally laid on, and the expense of laying it on for this special purpose would be too great. The Report says, indeed, that with a "public system of water supply" for the metropolis the expense would be inconsiderable; but here, as in other passages of the Report, we are referred to some age of comprehensive scientific management of all these matters which certainly has not yet arrived. The authors of the Report sometimes display a curious faculty for adapting facts to desired conclusions. Thus they seem to assume that the deaths in the streets, which average more than two hundred in the year, arise from the conditions of the streets and of the traffic, whereas many accidents are caused by careless driving. The evil of changes from one system of paving to another does not need to be insisted on. "Horses are very nervous on going from one pavement to another." But before we can apply one system of paving throughout we must settle what it shall be. The Report insists that asphalt would not be slippery if plentifully washed, and this condition might be ensured if there were a constant supply of water in the mains, which again would diminish the danger to life from fire. It is perhaps true that horses do not hurt themselves so much when they fall on asphalt as on stone, and, on the other hand, they find it much more difficult to get up. A French Report which is strongly favourable to asphalt admits the necessity of using sand to help the struggling horses to their feet. A shopkeeper in Cheapside stated that he believed that asphalt was less slippery than granite pavement. He put the falls before his shop at two a day on asphalt as against three on stone. Recently the slipping on that line on account of its "greasy" condition occasioned an outcry for better cleansing, which the authorities met by flooding the street.

The recommendation of asphalt by the Committee would be more forcible if it dealt more completely with the objections to this material. Ratepayers approve of that which lessens expense, and shopkeepers of that which diminishes noise, but we are not told what owners of houses say to this form of road. It is odd that in the same page which speaks of the gain from noiselessness in wood and asphalt, the opinion is quoted of a French Professor, who is evidently regarded as an authority, objecting to wood because it deadens noise to a degree that is dangerous for foot-passengers. The Committee were surprised at the few answers sent by occupiers of houses to questions propounded by them. But, on consideration, they became aware that there are in the City very few residents living and sleeping with their families. They have all removed to the purer air and quiet of suburban residence. All the Aldermen, the Lord Mayor, and their families, and many even of the hotel-keepers, are stated to have gone into the suburbs. "These influential persons care the less about the condition of the streets on account of the shorter time they are there." The like change which has extended to other districts of the metropolis requires, say the Committee, to be taken into account in any new administrative arrangement in respect to them. They then state certain observations of the wear of asphalt, which seem to show that the reduction in bulk is small, and due to compression rather than abrasion. On the other hand, we all know that the reduction in bulk of granite blocks used for pavement is large and rapid. It does not need to quote figures to prove that which is constantly under our eyes; and if there be less abrasion from asphalt, there must be less dust and dirt. Tenacity of material is accompanied by a feeling almost of elasticity to the tread of the foot, and yet there is great non-conductibility of vibration or sound. We assume that these qualities are truly ascribed to asphalt, but surely the enumeration of them falls short of a demonstration of its utility. The Committee do not of course pretend that it is suitable to inclines. They tell us that a member of the Committee, who has given much attention to the construction of roads, has been led to propose a new form of road to obviate the difficulties as to inclines, and effect economy in road construction and wear and tear, reduction of dirt, and facility of cleansing. This plan is based upon the Italian principle of smooth wheel tracks, substituting hard and smooth asphalt for slabs of granite or other stone, while the whole road, the horse track and the wheel track, would be impermeable and washable. The horse track, as we understand, would be composed of a "concrete macadam," which would perhaps give sufficient foothold to horses ascending a hill, but the author of the plan seems to have forgotten that horses have to come downhill. It may be quite true, as he says, that London ought to have been built, and might have been built, without hills, but at any rate the suburbs of London contain hills which must always be inevitable. We should like to know upon what principle he proposes to ascend and descend Hampstead Hill. The "impermeability" of streets is insisted on for sanitary reasons, which are highly important in towns, but lose much of their value as we get into the suburbs. It may be doubted whether for ordi-

nary roads any improvement is likely to be made upon Macadam's plan, but it cannot fairly be applied when the material is flint, which reduces itself to powder within three weeks, as is stated to be the case in the roads leading to the Crystal Palace.

On the whole, we must call this an unpractical Report, and we think this condemnation is especially deserved by the chapter which treats of the application of steam-power to road traction. The difficulty of using ordinary steam-engines in crowded streets is, we believe, insuperable; for although some horses may be trusted to face them, all horses will not, and the mischief that may be done by a frightened horse is formidable. We are, indeed, told that a "fireless" locomotive has been employed at New Orleans. It is supplied with water from stationary boilers, and as this water gives off steam to the engine, its temperature, and the corresponding pressure of the steam, continually diminish until a new station is reached, and a fresh supply of steam is taken in. The Report complains strongly of the want of unity of administration in the metropolis; but the defect seems rather to be of plan. If it could be settled what is the best kind of paving, there would not be much difficulty in adopting it. But this Report raises questions rather than settles them. The testimony of Continental Europe in favour of paved roads is strong, and it may be doubted whether Macadam's system is now fairly tried even in this country, because few roads are now as well maintained as they were in the period between the close of the great war and the completion of the chief railways. We should certainly think that the suburban roads might be improved by the introduction of granite tramways, and as regards asphalt, we should like to have a full inquiry by some body of persons less crotchety than this Committee of the Society of Arts. It is a pity that the art of literary composition should not be one of those which the Society cultivates. A more unpleasant composition than this Report we have seldom read. It flies off from whatever may be the subject in hand to denounce the variety and confusion of jurisdictions in the metropolis; and although this is a most important subject, it should be dealt with separately and once for all. In certain parts of North Wales they make slate serve for everything—benches, bedsteads, tables, are all made of it. The Committee seem to be possessed with a belief in the universal utility of asphalt, and they would think better of the British Constitution if the floor of the House of Commons were formed of the composition called Val de Travers.

REVIEWS.

MALLESON'S NATIVE STATES OF INDIA.*

THE appearance of this work strikes us as singularly opportune. The recent proceedings at Baroda have brought into the field a host of writers who have discussed the relations which exist, or which they think ought to exist, between the native States of India and the British Government. Information regarding the rise, progress, degradation and extinction of Hindu and Mohammedan families, regarding their territories, tributes, and privileges, regarding the peculiarities of their climate, and the tribes over which they exercise or claim supremacy, is certainly to be had in standard works by Anglo-Indian authors, and can be extracted from arrays of Blue-books at the India Office. But some of these works are out of print; others are not easy of access. Mr. C. U. Aitchison's *Collection of Treaties*, each of which is prefaced by a concise historical summary of events, stands out pre-eminent for accuracy and clearness. But for those who want one volume to take the place of eight, Colonel Malleison's new work is excellently suited. The author makes no pretensions to original views or independent research. He has laid under contribution, besides the collection of State papers just mentioned, Sir John Malcolm, Wilks's *Mysore*, Mr. Grant-Duff's *History of the Mahrattas*, and the delightful but somewhat discursive *Annals of Rajasthan*. He has, of course, not overlooked such weighty authorities as Mill and Elphinstone, and he has gleaned from gazetteers, summaries, articles in Oriental Reviews and Asiatic Journals, a mass of facts which, if hard and uninteresting, are yet most necessary to be mastered by all who would enlighten the English public as to the proper mode of laying an indictment against a quasi-independent ruler, or as to the exact etiquette to be observed during the tour of the Prince of Wales.

Colonel Malleison has been before the public as a successful author for nearly twenty years. One of the most common complaints made by the Indian official of the present day was touched on incidentally by the member for the Elgin Burghs in his recent articles in the *Contemporary Review*. It is that hardworked men have no time to generalize their conclusions. Sinecures have long been swept away. Offices which admitted of some leisure for scholarly research or historical investigation are now amalgamated with others. New duties have been imposed on men who were already severely tasked. District officers live under threats of visitations similar to that which Sir Anthony Absolute intended for his disobedient son. They may not have to ogle an ill-

featured partner all day and to sit up writing sonnets to her all night, but they are required to visit gaols, dispensaries, hospitals and ferries, rest-houses, and subdivisional courts, at some time or other of the twenty-four hours, and afterwards to satisfy Accountants and Commissioners by the regulated number of descriptive paragraphs and by the full tale of statistical columns. From this fate Colonel Malleison has been rescued by three successive Viceroys, and for the last five years he has filled the post of Guardian to the Maharaja of Mysore, for which he was specially selected by the late Lord Mayo. It must be obvious that the position is one which demands tact, good sense, and judicious supervision, rather than close confinement at the desk. Indeed, the strict discharge of duties by a conscientious guardian is not in the least incompatible with his turning an ample leisure to good account; while in one sense his office is far more important than one which consists in the collection of public revenue of hundreds of thousands of pounds, or the punctual decisions of cases involving property and life. To instil into a native sovereign the first principles of statecraft may lead to more striking results in the future than to have governed a British province for five years by schools, roads, dispensaries, and taxation levied in strict harmony with political economy. The weakest point in Orientalism has been the early training of the sons of successful and acknowledged rulers. Adversity, hard knocks, and oppression elevate a commandant of irregulars into the founder of a powerful dynasty and the capable ruler of a great State. But few natives can stand prosperity. We of course have tried various means to teach a young Rajput or Mahratta prince, born in the purple, the commonest rudiments of government. We have lavished on him grandmotherly advice. We have taken minors, heirs to estates in our own provinces, under the Court of Wards. We have administered principalities of all sorts and sizes, temporarily, until the young princes came of age. The experiment of a Rajkumar college, or Eton, for the sons of the aristocracy is at this moment being tried with some success. It was rightly thought that, if the despotic ruler of Mysore was to be qualified to raise and expend properly a revenue of nearly 1,100,000*l.* from a population of 5 millions, covering 27,000 square miles, this consummation would be best attained by placing him under the guardianship of a highly-educated official, and by giving no opening for the intrigues of priests, parasites, and vile old women. And if Colonel Malleison shall succeed in turning out a genuine specimen of the benevolent despot, and not a weak puppet or a savage tyrant; if the sovereign of this splendid region shall show no inclination to oscillate between the debaucheries of Nero and the rapine of Verrès; if he shall not hide the sensuality of the harem beneath the drapery and veneer conferred by an education in Gray's Odes and Goldsmith's Essays; if his religious creed shall be something higher and better than a belief in expensive ceremonies, ridiculous cosmogony, and childish explanations of the Divine attributes; if he engrafts on his ancestral traditions and customs something beyond a mere capacity to enjoy beefsteaks and to consume pale ale—if, in short, he shows himself vigorous, just, enlightened, and able to use his unrivalled opportunities for the good of his subjects, his own honour, and the permanence of his dynasty—then, most assuredly, Colonel Malleison will have amply justified his own selection, and will have silenced the criticism of those who think that Lord Salisbury's policy of 1867 is a mere attempt to rear heart of oak in a dark cellar or to set upright an empty sack.

The author has shown judgment in the arrangement and division of his work. He groups together the native principalities by their geographical position, and not by their extent, area, or political significance. The reader is not distracted by having to hurry from Sindia to the Nizam, or from Cashmere to Travancore, because of some similarity in their status or engagements. The whole Indian panorama is divided, in fact, into six tableaux. First in historical dignity come the Rajput States, eighteen in number, of which fifteen are Rajput pure, two are Jat, and one is Mohammedan, that well-known principality of Tonk. It was by not following the precedent afforded by the deposition of its Nawab that we drifted into the *exemplum trahens perniciem veniens in avum* in the case of the Gaikwar. Next come the great chiefs of Central India, and they are succeeded by those of Bundelcund, neither Rajputs nor Mahrattas, but known as Bhagelas or Bundelas. Of the origin of the latter Colonel Malleison gives a curious explanation, characteristic of Oriental habits of thought. From Bundelcund we go to Western India, to Cutch, Kolhapore, Sawunt Warree, and Baroda. Southern India gives us two very large principalities, Mysore and Hyderabad; and two of moderate size, Cochin and Travancore. The section of Northern India comprises Cashmere, the various Sikh States, and Bahawalpore. The petty chiefships scattered all over the Indian peninsula, from Tipperah in Eastern Bengal to Kattywar in the presidency of Bombay, and from Puddocotta in Madras to Garhwal in the Himalayas, are collected together in the final or seventh chapter, under the title of "Minor and Mediatized Chiefs." There is thus every gradation of power, from the Mahratta sovereign who maintains a disciplined army—horse, foot, and artillery—exercises a criminal jurisdiction exceeding that of Highland chieftains before 1745, and has a Resident accredited to his Court, down to the Thakur who holds two or three villages on a quit rent of one thousand rupees.

It must be owned that the history of many of these families is not attractive or edifying, and the volume, in the eyes of the ordinary reader, is liable to the standard objections brought

* An Historical Sketch of the Native States of India in Subsidiary Alliance with the British Government, with a Notice of the Mediatized and Minor States. By Colonel G. B. Malleison, C.S.I., Bengal Staff Corps, &c. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1875.

against all summaries, however pregnant with instruction or excellently packed with facts. Oriental names, spelt after a system of transliteration which is the delight of pedants and the despair of scholars, are plentifully scattered over every page. Assassinations, violent transitions, examples of cruelty, treachery, confiscation, incapacity, impart a family likeness to successive groups of Rajputs, Mahrattas, and Mohammedans. Here and there the career of a vigorous prince affords the writer an opportunity which he does not throw away. The sketches of Madhaji Sindia, "the ablest statesman" and the "most far-seeing" warrior of the Mahrattas; the account of Bhopal and of its late ruler, the Secundra Begum, whose administrative talents would hardly discredit the school of Monro or Thomason; and that of Mysore, a country which we handed back to the Hindu family overthrown by the celebrated grandson of a Lahore trooper, are very good specimens of luminous historical exposition. Colonel Malleon, of course, leaves the historic Hyder and Tippoo to the ordinary narrator of battles and sieges. But one anecdote regarding the former, if not new, is certainly not often quoted. It suited this Eastern *Caporal* to have a puppet or sham Raja chosen from the children of the dynasty which he had supplanted. And one little fellow, invited at a child's feast to make his selection amongst fruits, sweetmeats, and toys, took up a brilliant dagger in his right hand, and afterwards a line in his left. "That is the Raja," said the astute soldier; "his first care is military protection; his second to realize the produce of his dominions." Put in a slightly different shape, this is the very moral conveyed to the unlucky borderer who was expelled from the cavern on the Eildon Hills by the magician, for sounding the trumpet before he was ready to fight:—

"Woe, woe!" he cried, "thou coward, that ever thou wert born;
Why drew ye not the knightly sword, before ye blew the horn?"

We may be quite certain, however, that Hyder had never heard of the Border Minstrelsy, or of Walter Scott.

This publication of Colonel Malleon, as we began by remarking, is to us chiefly valuable for its lessons and deductions. We are sorry to say, however, that the author has accepted some of the commonplaces which are propounded on platforms by philanthropists who insist on it that the natives were far more comfortable under Akbar than under Wellesley; in the hands of Shah Jehan than in those of Lawrence or of Bentinck. The Mohammedan Government, he says, "lived in the country, acting and reacting on the people." And he goes on to explain how the splendour of their courts and the wealth of their aristocracy redounded to the benefit of the people, while the administration of public affairs was to a great extent in the hands of the natives, who formed the civil administration and shared in the command of the armies. He adds that these advantages touch the mainspring of national life and prosperity, and that they fail in our system. Now no more enlightened, acute, and well-informed traveller than Bernier ever wrote about India, and he wrote just two centuries ago. There are pages after pages of his which tell a very different story. He had neither constituents to gratify, nor theories to support by subsequent exhumation of facts, nor predictions to be squared with events; and yet his deductions as to comfort and prosperity are the very reverse. As regards the admission of natives to higher offices, Colonel Malleon appears to forget that even such men as Akbar must have taken into service the supple and astute Hindus just as he found them, without requiring a high standard of official integrity and virtue. The Mohammedans, far mightier with the sword than effete or undisciplined Rajas, had no monopoly of administrative skill, and hardly any ideal of public morality. A Mussulman Subahdar or Viceroy delegated to distant provinces was probably very little, if at all, superior to the ancient representatives of the States of Vidarbha, Magadha, or Gour, who, but for the Moguls and Pathans, would have been collecting the revenue and dispensing the patriarchal system of the stick, the knife, and the hot irons, which we read about in Manu. If the natives wish to share "in the principal offices of the administration," they must ascend to our level, and discard the lax notions and the pliant morality with which they imbue all social and political life. One main justification of our being in India at all is that we do not intend to admit natives to a share in the government of their own country except on our principles. As to the command of the armies, the less said of this the better. It is possible to conceive, in some distant future, the appointment of a native financier or prefect in a British State. The appointment of General Jai Mangul Sing or of Brigadier Ashraf-ud-Dowlah to command the Umballa or the Allahabad Division, with English regiments under him, does not, to our thinking, enter even into the category of pleasing prospects or seductive dreams.

But the work suggests several other topics of the gravest character. At the time of the renewal of the last Charter of the Company certain statistical papers showed that the native States of India covered an area of more than 700,000 square miles, contained races numbering more than 50 millions, and enjoyed revenues of more than 10 millions. The military forces of the same States then aggregated 400,000; infantry, cavalry, and artillery. The total tribute paid to us by these feudatories barely exceeded one million. Recent statements tend to prove that the total of the inhabitants, of the forces, and of the revenues, was probably understated, or has since increased. Now these Rajas contribute a sum to the Imperial treasury which is ludicrously disproportionate to the security and protection which they enjoy under our rule, and to their opportunities for developing commerce and amassing wealth. Foreign

invasion is simply impossible. Equally impossible is it that Sindia should march a detachment of his troops into Indore, or that two of the oldest Rajput princes should settle by the sword a dispute as to precedence. A third contingency, that of the rebellion of ill-used masses against the cruelties or exactions of an irresponsible despot, is also beyond the pale of ordinary chances. While, then, the princes of the first or second rank owe us much, the host of chiefs of the third rank, numbering more than three hundred in Colonel Malleon's catalogue, literally owe us everything. There is not one of these gentlemen who might not be absorbed, annexed, or "requisitioned" to-morrow by his neighbour, but for our presence. And scores of cases happen at intervals of which the British public hears and cares nothing, when the interference of the Viceroy is sought for successfully to save a State from bankruptcy, a family from extinction, a whole people from despair. Now the main deduction we draw from records like the present is that there must be henceforth an end of any attempt to erect a new tribunal for the settlement of mal-administration, or any other contingency arising in these semi-civilized States. The late well-meant endeavour to make the Old Bailey paramount over the Foreign Office should never be repeated, and we are glad to see that Lord Salisbury founds a sufficient argument "against the adoption of a similar procedure, if unhappily a similar occasion for it was ever to arise." The Viceroy cannot again be permitted to shift his own responsibility to a Commission, or to invent a new-fangled machinery, however eminent the offender or however delicate the subject of dispute. He must vigorously govern this motley congress of powers and principalities by his own sense of what is due to the equities which they can claim, and to the dignity and authority which he is bound to uphold. If he does wrong, there is a direct appeal from him to the responsible Minister in this country and to the British Parliament. We thank Colonel Malleon for enabling us to point this moral.

MURRAY'S HANDBOOKS FOR NORTHUMBERLAND.*

THESE are severally the latest editions of these Handbooks, and there is only the difference of a year in the date of the two. But the difference in knowledge and in the capacity for taking in knowledge which is displayed in the two is less than that of a year than of a generation. The two together take in the ancient kingdom of Northumberland, as it stood after the first advances of the Scottish power. And they are properly divided according to the two great divisions of that kingdom. But Deira and Bernicia have clearly fallen into different hands, and Deira has fallen into far better hands than Bernicia. The Yorkshire book shows a knowledge of the history, a general grasp of things, a readiness to make use of the latest lights, which are utterly wanting in the book for Durham and Northumberland. The author of the latter makes a kind of excuse in his Preface, because "the interest of the northern counties rests mainly on the habits and customs of their people, both as they are seen at present, and as they are handed down by the ballads and traditions of former times." There are so many stories of "heroic exploits and romantic adventures" that "a resident, to whom these stories are familiar, would consider no handbook of any value which confined itself to the mere description of places and buildings, which would be all that would be required in a southern county." Now we altogether deny both that heroic exploits and romantic adventures are confined to the northern counties, and that mere description of places and buildings would be enough in a southern county. There are plenty of ballads and traditions in the South also, though we do not say that they are so thick on the ground as they are in the North. And both in the North and the South something is needed besides ballads and traditions, besides descriptions of places and buildings. A handbook of such pretensions as those published by Mr. Murray should be written in a spirit of intelligent appreciation of the local history. By this we mean both the distinct history of the district, where there is any, and the contributions of the district to the general history of the country. Now the Yorkshire book is written in this spirit; the Durham and Northumberland book is not. Or, it might be more accurate to say that the one has been revised in such a spirit and the other has not. For we remember the Yorkshire book in a former state of being, and it was not then what it is now. In short, the difference between the two is very aptly marked out in their several title-pages. The Durham and Northumberland book may have been "revised"; but it is the Yorkshire book only that has been "thoroughly revised."

The difference begins in the Introduction. The writer of the Yorkshire book, in his general sketch of the history of the district, shows that he has really mastered the history of southern Northumberland, while the two Introductions to the two counties comprised in the other book show equally that their author has not mastered the history of northern Northumberland. His sketch of the history of Durham is hardly more than a sketch of the history of the bishopric, but it takes care to confound the most important points in the history of the bishopric. For instance, the writer falls into the vulgar way of talking about monks when there were no monks. Nothing is more certain than that the monks were

* *A Handbook for Travellers in Durham and Northumberland.* New and revised Edition. London: Murray. 1873.

A Handbook for Travellers in Yorkshire. New Edition, thoroughly revised. London: Murray. 1874.

brought from Jarrow and Monkwearmouth to Durham under William of St. Carilef, though oddly enough the secular priests who had before held the church had a fancy for choosing monks as their bishops, and though the monastic historian of Durham tries rather to slur over the fact by using vague words whenever he has to speak of the secular canons. In the Handbook we get monks in the days of Ealdhun, and the schemes of Walcher, carried out by his successor William, are wiped out. So, when we get to the church of Durham itself, the description is of the most unintelligent kind. Of the remarkable history of the eastern parts of the minster, marking, as they do, one of the great epochs in the history of architecture, the contrast between the magnificent work of the Bishop in the choir and the feeble continuation of the monks—when the monks did come—in the transept, though the tale is so clearly told by the local historian, not a word seems to have reached the author of the Handbook. All that he can do is to use his paste and scissors, and to make extracts from Billings, a writer who fancied that the pulpit in the refectory at Carlisle was a confessional, and drew a picture of it accordingly. At Monkwearmouth, just in the same way, he shows no understanding whatever of the process by which the porch of Benedict Biscop grew into the present tower, though the whole thing had been brought to light some years before the Handbook was printed. This description is about as lucky as the illustration given in Mr. Parker's *Introduction to the Study of Gothic Architecture*, where the most characteristic features were left out, and things which never were there put in instead. Some further points have indeed been brought to light still more recently, but neither the description in the Handbook nor Mr. Parker's woodcut gives any notion of what was plain to be seen at the time when they were both published. So, when he passes from Durham into Northumberland, there is the same utter lack of intelligence, even when the description is not positively inaccurate. Nothing, for instance, can show less understanding of the time, even when the statements are not actually wrong, than the account of the Northumbrian earls in p. 139. And more grotesque still is the statement next before, how "in 547 a Saxon called Ida the Flamebearer landed on the English coast and became king of Bernicia." It would have been hardly possible to devise a sentence which more carefully got rid of all that is characteristic in the early history of the Northumbrian kingdom.

In all these points the Yorkshire book is a marked contrast. Here and there doubtless it might still be improved, but it everywhere shows real work from the best sources. There is all the difference in the world between the introductory sketch of the history of Deira and the introductory sketch of the history of Bernicia, and there is all the difference in the world between the description of the history of the minster at York and the description of the minster at Durham. At Kirkdale the writer of the account in the *Transactions of the Associated Societies* might have learned something of the peculiarities of the building about which he was writing, if he had only taken the trouble to look in the Handbook. At Lastingham we are not quite sure that the writer of the Handbook fully understood the singular and very difficult history of the church; but at all events he came far nearer to doing so than the describer who has come since. And, fresh from the confusions of the writer of the Durham book about the Northumbrian earls, it is a comfort to turn to the account in the Yorkshire book of the Battle of the Standard, where the true position of David is much more clearly put, though it is a pity to talk about the eldest son of the King of Scots as *Prince Henry*. And so, wherever we turn through the two books, we find that in the Durham book the chief historical or architectural fact of the place is either left out or slurred over or told in the dull way of one who does not thoroughly understand it; while in the Yorkshire book all these things are carefully attended to, and are told for the most part in a clear and correct way, with references to the best sources, old and new. The one writer, in short, has kept himself abreast of the advances in knowledge which have been made in later years on all these points, while the other has either never heard of, or has wilfully shut his eyes to, all that scholars have been doing for some years past. It is amusing to go with our present guide to Coningsborough and Sprotborough, and to see how calmly the inventions both of the twelfth century and of the nineteenth are laid aside. We are told how Wace and Layamon "and many a later chronicler" have followed Geoffrey of Monmouth. "So has," the Handbook goes on, "Mr. Scott Surtees, the present vicar of Sprotborough, in his *Waifs and Strays of Northumber History*, an ingenious writer, whose arguments in proof of Geoffrey's assertions are not likely to be accepted by many beside himself." Presently, at Sprotborough itself, we read, "According to Mr. Surtees, Sprotborough is one of the centres of early English history; but the tourist who desires to examine its pretensions must be referred to the book in which they are set forth." Then our guide cruelly adds:—"To most persons Sprotborough will seem a place of no very great interest, with a church containing some ancient portions, and a singular stone chair, with grotesque sculpture, which Mr. Surtees, who makes Sprotborough the 'Campodunum' of Bede, thinks 'may have witnessed the rites both of Coifi and Paulinus.' It is not earlier than the thirteenth or fourteenth century." It is however hard to pass by the undoubted fact that Sprotborough and its neighbour Barnborough are both among the few places in Yorkshire which are not marked as "waste" in Domesday. And, while we are told of the rector of Sprotborough, who believes in Geoffrey, one might have looked for some mention of the rector of Barnborough,

who has re-edited Giraldus and has given us St. Hugh. From Sprotborough we turn by a natural impulse to Stamfordbridge—if we had any East-Anglian Handbook beside us we would turn to Cromer—and there we find that the version of the Handbook follows, not the last lights, but the last lights but one. That is to say, Stamfordbridge is left at Stamfordbridge. It is not moved to some other place, we forget exactly where, but most likely, if not within the parish of Sprotborough, at any rate within the postal delivery of Doncaster.

At Goodmanham, the Godmundingaham of *Bæda*, the scene of the famous iconoclastic exploit of Coifi, the Handbook tells us that "there are some traces of a vallum encircling the churchyard." We will not say that there are not, but, though we wished very much to find them, we failed in the search. On the other hand, we have good authority for saying that the "extensive and strange-looking earthworks in a field about a hundred yards to the south of the church," whatever they are, are not wholly "caused by a modern chalk-pit." We need hardly say that the writer mentions only to cast aside the tale of St. John of Beverley being a Master of Arts of Oxford and Fellow of University College; but we should have liked some stronger protest than the words, "not to add that St. John had been dead nearly a century before the birth of Alfred, the traditional founder of the University." In other places the writer of this Handbook has shown himself quite able to distinguish between real tradition and wilful falsehood.

On the whole, if the publisher of this useful series will take our advice, he will call in his Northumberland and Durham book, which is of very little use, and have it rewritten by the reviser of the Handbook for Yorkshire.

THE LIFE OF ST. TERESA.*

RELIGION has at all times offered woman an undisputed field for the development and exercise of her highest powers. However repressed elsewhere, she may here find scope for what is exceptionally great or emotional in her nature. We cannot wonder, therefore, that in days when the question of woman's place and influence is regarded by many of themselves as the question of the hour, all harbingers of the movement should be sought out and exhibited, and that, for the sake of their services as leaders, their principles and the cause they advocated should sink into secondary questions as compared with their power in working out and their success in achieving their aims. Women of the most diverse and antagonistic opinions can meet on the same ground and express a kindred enthusiasm for one who has proved to the world what woman can do. The compiler of the present volume, in her admiration for the great qualities of her heroine, writes as if unconscious of theological differences, and triumphs "in the vessel of *Reform* steered by the hand of a woman, escaping into smooth waters," regardless of the doctrinal meaning of that word common with English readers. In the same spirit "George Eliot" accepts the Saint as her ideal woman, and eloquently sympathizes with "Theresa's passionate nature which demanded an epic life." What, she asks, "were many-volumed romances of chivalry and the social conquests of a brilliant girl to her? Her flame quickly burnt up that light fuel, and, fed from within, soared after some illimitable satisfaction, some object which would never justify weariness, which would reconcile self-despair with the rapturous consciousness of life beyond self. She found her epos in the reform of a religious order."

For ourselves we confess, in pursuing the career of this eager spirit, and watching the energy of its self-devotion and self-denial, to something of the feeling which Cowper expresses when asked his judgment on public affairs:—"A man that lives as I do, whose chief occupation is to walk ten times in a day from the fireside to his cucumber frame and back again, cannot show his wisdom more, if he has any wisdom to show, than by leaving the mysteries of government to the management of persons in point of situation and information better qualified for the business." How shall we "indolent reviewers," whose business has so much that is akin with the poet's, whose calling it is to extract whatever sunbeams lurk in the opacity of literary and symbolical cucumbers, coolly inspect and analyse this life of prayer and vision and almost superhuman effort? It is a grave question. For to dispute what purports to be directly miraculous in the Saint's narrative—the vision, for example, of an angel—to attribute all that is supernatural to illusion or to psychological causes not then sought into, scarcely removes the difficulty in the case of the ordinary, but still candid, reader, because so much that is strange and contrary to common experience still remains. There is this in St. Teresa, that we must believe her. She has both the intention to be true and the faculty of distinct statement. What she says she emphatically means, and every mental phase which she describes she apprehends through a clear intellect. We may call whatever is beyond our comprehension and beyond our experience or sympathy in this direction "mysticism"; but this only veils by a word the wonderful difference of mind from mind. Happily, however, for our humility thus put to the blush before the transcendental, the Saint's human nature was quite as strongly marked as her spiritual being. She had as distinct an individuality—what we call character—as any one amongst us. Her sanctity never interfered with her naturalness. Her common sense is as eminent, we will say, as the spiritual exal-

* *The Life of St. Teresa*. By the Author of "Devotions Before and After Holy Communion." London: Macmillan & Co. 1875.

tation. It is this, perhaps unusual, combination which creates the reliance we feel in her candour and truth; there is an understanding between us. Wherever there is nature we feel at home, know where we are, and have at least some materials whereon to form a judgment.

In the first place, through all the genius, indomitable strength of will, and powers of organization, we never lose sight of the woman; we might say—with reverence be it spoken—the charming woman. She wished to please—owning the desire to give pleasure as one of her faults—and knew how to do it. As she says of herself in girlhood, "Our Lord had given me the grace to please every one wherever I might be." No saint had ever so few enemies; she had none, we may say, who ever came in personal contact with her. If she could only get at people—king or noble, bishop or vicar-general—she felt she could carry her point. She had a way with her. While acting most as the master-mind, it is in a tone of deprecation:—"Although it be true that we poor women are not fit to give advice, yet occasionally we hit the mark." She expresses the profoundest respect for the learning of which she had no share. "Do you, my daughters, go always for direction to learned men." "It is very necessary for prioresses to have learned men for their directors." But throughout, an unflinching self-reliance, not uncommon in her sex, led her to choose for herself the learned men whom she was implicitly to obey; and we detect a tone both hot and cold towards learning itself. Thus, in her great object of changing the Mitigated Rule of the Carmelite order for the severer original Rule, she consults learned men; but when Father Ibáñez sends her a reply "full of objections and theology," she answers him that, in order to escape from her vocation, "she did not want any theology to help her." The obedience for which she was a great stickler was subject to the same feminine reservations. Like all terrestrial things, the rule of obedience has its loopholes, and cleverness is never a more conspicuous ally of conscience than in this direction. Thus, "determined not to be hindered," and knowing that, if she spoke to her superiors, "all was lost," she took the course of asking no leave, since "she made it a great point to do nothing against obedience." In fact, the two great steps of her life were taken clandestinely. For at the outset, as she could not prevail on her father to allow her to become a nun, at least in his lifetime, she had left her home secretly for the Carmelite convent of the Incarnation, where previously she had been placed by him for a time when his own house, without a mistress, was considered unsuitable for a beautiful girl who enjoyed society, "kept the conversation alive," and felt the excitements incident to such a position. Of course the argument is that she was led by a higher direction, which not only permitted, but necessitated, these deviations from ordinary duty; but there is a natural side to it all. We recognize in St. Teresa one of those natures which are conscious to themselves of a guide impelling them forward, which never allows them to rest in inaction or passive agreement. They hear a voice unheard by others, they see a hand others cannot see, they find no rest in anything attained, but must pass it by and reach on. This inward guide, whether the heat of their own spirit or a diviner inspiration, stands in the way of passive obedience—it will be heard, and will be master. Those who are most strenuous in enforcing a rule on others accept no rule quite in the same spirit in which they require others to observe it. A paramount obedience to private judgment strikes us sometimes as a characteristic of sainthood. At first it is opposed as such; and Teresa had to endure the suspicions of good and learned men, that her longings after a stricter life were presumptuous, and her inspiration an illusion of the devil. It was her woman's tact, cloaking her indomitable will, even to herself, in submission, and her self-confidence in humility, which carried her through to the haven where she would be.

Every severity of rule which she carries out is counted a triumph of divine grace, and when she has founded vast numbers of monasteries and nunneries of Discalced Carmelites, all observant of the primitive rule, it is treated as a great reform, as it is indeed a wonderful evidence of a woman's genius; but we may remark that it is not in societies thus constituted that great minds are trained. St. Teresa spent her youth in the world, saw society as far as a Spanish woman of that day could be said to see it, and lived for years after taking the veil under the Mitigated Rule. At no time of her life was she cut off from the society, on equal terms, of men of cultivated minds and large experience. This liberty and intercourse was essential, we see, to the full development of her powers. In no school where women have been teachers has the same strictness directed their own training which they would enforce on their pupils or disciples. It is this narrowed, restricted life imposed by others which fills the external observer with doubt and pity, and makes sacrifices so painful in our idea. It is not the founders of institutions who excite our compassion. The secular imagination, having no experience of the pain of austerities, makes light of them when they are enlivened by the freedom of voluntary selection and the stimulus of kindred minds working in the same path. When Teresa makes merry at Fra Antonio's sole preparation for house-keeping—his providing five hour-glasses before he had a bed to lie on—saying he was not going without provision for keeping regular hours; or, again, when she finds him sweeping the door of the church with a joyful countenance, and, on her asking him what has become of his dignity, he replies, "I exorcise the time when I ever had any," we see that privation and humiliation had its gay side. Besides, it was easy to exorcise dignity under the approving eye and smile of St. Teresa, whose fascination of words and

manner is dwelt upon, and who always found men more easy to manage than women. But it is sweeping rooms and observing rigid hours *without* sympathy, or anything deserving the name of companionship, that chills the fancy. It sometimes seems as if founders and institutors of austerities were not sensible of these differences of position. It was the cold observation of two of her learned friends that nuns, for the most part, are discontented people, and St. Teresa had, we are told, a great objection to melancholy, as if it were a disease of which she saw a good deal. She was constantly warning her nuns against low spirits, and set down with calm ridicule the nervous fears which seized on less courageous tempers. In an old, rambling, desolate building, where she was to found a House, one poor nun could not resign herself to sleep on the straw, their only bed, and excused herself when questioned, "'Mother, I am thinking, if I were to die now, what you would do all alone.' I answered her, 'Sister, when that shall happen, I will consider what I shall do; now let me go to sleep.'" Their scruples do not meet with more sympathy than their fears. "If the nuns are to have shoes"—for the women of the order were not permitted to go discalced—she begs the Provincial not to say what they are to be made of, but simply to say they may wear them, else their scruples would be endless. She recommended in theory the virtue of "detachment"—that crowning point of alienation between the secular and the technically religious; but this was a stretch of sanctity to which her affectionate, cordial, and natural character could not attain. To the end she could not help loving her nuns and her friends in the world, and found the effort of detaching herself "of no use." We regard it as something akin to this human weakness, as some have deemed it, that she preserved her taste for clean linen, through all austerities, and pleaded for even clean table linen for her nuns. Even in dying, when her devoted nurse, whom she begged not to leave her, changed her coif and sleeves, she smiled sweet thanks, "being pleased at the fresh linen, and truly during her life she had always shown this care for cleanliness and grace in everything." Nor is her death itself without natural touches. "When she saw," writes the good nun, "that I had returned, she put her arms about me with much love, and caressing me tenderly, laid her head in my arms, and thus I held her, and was embraced by her until she expired."

We have scarcely yet touched on the mystical side of St. Teresa's character; that aspect of it which, however suspected at first, so much so that her friends feared for her the censure of the Inquisition, was the ground of her twofold renown as a great Spanish classic, classed with Ignatius Loyola and Cervantes, and a patron saint of Spain. Of her style we feel that a translation can give little idea. Nothing is so difficult to render in another idiom as graceful, transparent simplicity, and the difficulty is scarcely overcome in the present instance; but we can do homage to her sincerity and good sense even when we are disposed to see the truth of Blanco White's view, who as a Spaniard had experience of the temperament of mysticism:—"The modifications of enthusiasm are indeed innumerable, and the manner in which the thoughts of things invisible, constantly dwelt upon with vehemence, can affect the nervous system, has never been thoroughly investigated." We may note that Teresa was constitutionally subject to acute nervous pains, and that her supernatural visitations were always accompanied by them. Also perhaps we may add that she was disposed to suspect the reality of such assumed visitations in her nuns. Her own raptures were commonly a flash. When the sisters lingered in them she set them down to extreme austerities, which she consequently forbade or modified, with the result of putting an end to them. She is regarded as the head of the school of Spanish mystic philosophy—Catholic mysticism—and free from some of its errors. "'La présomption' (says Rousselot) 'est le péché mignon des mystiques,' a-t-on dit. Exceptons Sainte-Thérèse." "Jamais elle n'a osé dire que c'est aux serviteurs de prier et non à l'épouse." Her parable concerning prayer we would gladly extract, as illustrating her spiritual nature; she pictures the soul as a garden which may be watered in four different ways, representing the four distinct modes of prayer and intercourse with God, from prayer as ordinary Christians understand it to the fourth state, rapture and ecstatic trance, of which she records her own experiences. Throughout there is a depth and gravity of tone, which distinguishes her from the fanatic. In fact, she is extremely jealous of pretentious effusion in this direction. She exclaims, "From silly devotions, good Lord deliver us!" and also wonders at servants of God who are men of weight and learning depending so much as some of them do on their own emotions in prayer. "I am disgusted when I listen to them." She advocated Scripture—meaning the Gospels—rather than the "best composed books," as a preparation for prayer, and was suspicious of all enthusiastic direction, preferring a learned man without what she calls prayer—that is, mental prayer—to an ignorant director with it.

Her relations with the leading religious men of her time were marked by a union of submission and spirited remonstrance, of profound deference and the most free-spoken counsels. She was emphatically a Mother in Israel (though the Nuncio did once call her a restless gadabout woman), and practically, though not in word, recognized the position. We extract an example:—

Nor must her gentle reproof to Gratian be omitted. "I will tell you of a certain temptation which I have perceived, and still perceive, in Eliseus (Gratian himself). He seems to me at times not to be sufficiently careful to speak the whole truth in every matter; although I know it is in things of small moment, yet I could wish that he were much more accurate in this

way. Out of love I wish that you would persuade him to this in my name, for where this carelessness exists there entire perfection cannot be. You see in what things I interfere as if no other cares were pressing on me.

St. Teresa was a devoted, undoubting servant of her Church. The wave of thought set in motion by Luther only reached her with the effect of stimulating her powers to turn it back from Spain. Women were powerless. She must call men to the rescue. Hence her foundations of Carmelite Friars. How far she would have succeeded had not the national character been constitutionally opposed to the ideas which told so powerfully on the Teutonic nations is a question, or perhaps scarcely a question.

THE ENGINEER HISTORY OF THE WAR OF 1870-71.*

CAPTAIN MAY, who was as many-sided as far-seeing in his views of modern war, devoted a chapter of his *Retrospect* to criticisms on the shortcomings of the Prussian Engineers in 1866, and especially of that defect in military judgment which made them ready in the field to sacrifice the more pressing needs of time and place to those of finish and appearance. So truthful and close were the remarks of this writer on a branch of which infantry soldiers would, as a rule, take but little notice, that there were not wanting those who claimed the anonymous critic, when his first essay made him suddenly famous, for one of the Engineers themselves; just as others insisted on his belonging to the cavalry or the artillery, since no one, they argued, who had not served in those arms could show such a special knowledge of them. May formed a high estimate of the position which military Engineers were in future destined to occupy. They could not rise to the height of their calling, he said, until the chief Engineer of each commanding general was found constantly at his side, sharing his strategic or tactical confidences, and ready to co-operate instantly in his plans with the full power of the arm.

It is well known—indeed, the actual history of the late war may be read as a commentary on the fact—that although infantry, cavalry, and artillery had alike chafed and protested against the strictures of the *Retrospect*, yet each came into the field prepared to adopt its teachings. The very first great action, for example, the battle of Woerth, at once showed that May's lessons had been taken to heart by the artillery of the Third Army; as the first great march in advance, that of the First and Second Armies from the Saar to the Moselle, proved that the cavalry were not a whit behind-hand in bringing into practical operation that part of the essay which exposed their shortcomings in Bohemia. As to the infantry, it is a fact known to every tyro that the whole course of the war tended to emancipate more and more this most important of the arms from the bondage of tradition against which May had protested; as it is not less notorious that the new experimental drill recently introduced among us in imitation of the Prussians is no other than the very "open order" system recommended by him in his pamphlet on "The Prussian Infantry," in 1869, and controverted semi-officially at the time under Count Moltke's own express inspiration, as was generally believed. The volume now before us is a testimony that the fourth arm of the service profited no less than the others in 1870 by the teaching of this born master of the military art. But it may well be doubted whether even May, when he uttered his dictum on the future of field engineering, foresaw how soon that art was to be brought into such prominence that the historian would be able to trace it through every turn and combination of the widespread operations of 1870.

Yet such is actually the case. The work under notice (or rather that of Captain Goetze, for Colonel Graham has given us as yet but the first volume of the original German) undertakes a task which has never before been tried, as indeed it has not been necessary. For it is no mere technical history of the sieges or entrenchments that formed fragments of a great war, but actually an Engineer's narrative of the whole of it, so skilfully done that, without making his own arm unreasonably obtrusive, the author shows that scarcely a single movement of importance was made, or any operation planned, without calling upon the Engineers for assistance absolutely needed by the rest of the army. Lay readers can of course fully understand the importance of the Engineers to an army engaged in sieges; or even to one placing itself in a position deliberately chosen for the purpose of being deliberately strengthened, such as the lines round Metz, for instance, which served their purpose of hemming in Bazaine so thoroughly. Indeed, the novelty and importance of the works constructed for such objects in 1870 by Captain Goetze and his comrades were singularly exaggerated in this country; a mistake due, no doubt, to the greatness of the results obtained. There was really little of novelty in the lines round Paris or Metz, still less in the elaborate siegeworks before Strasburg, that common sense would not at once have suggested to trained engineers who found themselves in possession of certain new materials. But what non-professional readers could not know of themselves, for military men are slow to grasp it, is that the two chief elements which have come into such vast importance in late wars—the combination of great numbers on the field of action, and the movement of these with a celerity hitherto un-

heard of—depend upon a constant, and almost daily application of the means afforded by the growth of engineering science. Without railroads to furnish the main lines of supply, telegraphs to connect the scattered operations, and the means of completing the ordinary communications along which the masses march, such numbers as it is now customary to bring under arms would be rather, what in Russia they proved to Napoleon, a burden than an advantage. And what is true here of strategy and its relation to engineering science applies hardly less to tactics. Hardly any position can be held or attacked, in these days of long-range weapons, without defence and assault turning on the stronger parts, as villages, farmhouses, and the like, known as the tactical points. Here the rough and ready skill of the engineer may make that almost impregnable which would of itself be weak. Here too—which is at first not quite so obvious—the engineers must accompany the infantry in its advance to turn the first lodgment to good account. In open country rude entrenchments must of course supply the place of natural tactical points. But in either case the engineer's art has grown to be an integral part of every great action.

All this supposes a sound and complete engineering organization. Without such it would be impossible to meet the demands that must come in from every quarter except by training a whole army of Engineers, a useless conception in the present state of European education. And Captain Goetze therefore only undertakes a necessary duty in commencing his work with a complete review of the resources which the Germans possessed in this respect in 1870. Unfortunately here the writer naturally assumes such a knowledge of the German military system as general readers, in this country at least, do not possess. And his translator, said to be as skilful in his profession as his services have shown him gallant in the field, has not supplied the need for those less well informed than himself. The only note given on the "technical troops" does not explain the war formation, except by reference to a table in the appendix. And although the fact is indicated that trained Engineers do serve largely in the Guards, Line, or Landwehr, the exact difference between such men and our own regimental pioneers, who are also artisans, is not made clear. It consists, in fact, chiefly in the larger proportion maintained by the German system of reserve. Though enrolled in other corps for registry purposes, such reserve men as had besides their trade knowledge some training as field-engineers would be drawn from their battalions and embodied, as needed in war, under Engineer officers as a supplement to the technical troops whose cadres are maintained on the peace establishment. Indeed, the too literal translation of the title is rather perplexing here, for we include in one general word Engineers those special branches—the field telegraphists for instance—which the German author distinguishes. And so complete was the peace organization in 1870, that the war was begun with a strength of eighty-eight Engineer companies (of which over sixty, formed into fifteen battalions, were equipped for the field), sixteen Telegraph detachments, six Railway detachments, besides several small special bodies. But neither author nor translator shows the wonderful elasticity of the German reserve system. Under this depot companies grew straight into battalions. Engineers were brought in from all branches of the reserve by the operation of the Landwehr registry. Reserve officers who had had their engineering training in old days and gone back to civil life, elderly men many of them, and stiff with desk work, but full of patriotic spirit, came forward voluntarily to fill the new cadres. And so as siege after siege went on, and casualties multiplied—due to hard work and exposure far more than to chassépot or mitrailleuse—one reserve company after another was formed, officered, equipped, and sent into the field. It is said that the end of the war found forty of these bodies on duty, officered very largely by men of the civil profession, but doing excellent service in the field. Is there no lesson here for those who know what vast resources of patriotism lie hid in our own imperfect and unorganized auxiliary forces? The real army reformer will be he who shall cause unworthy jealousies to be laid aside, show the military authorities how to develop the worth of the different elements of our defences, and bring the Legislature to the task of framing of the now disjointed services a whole that would make us invulnerable; a task which would not be as difficult as it seems, if party spirit were once in this matter to be put behind the good of the country both parties profess to serve.

One consideration more, and we shall leave Captain Goetze and his translator (whose mechanical work is excellently done) to speak for themselves. There is special reason why Englishmen should take interest in this novel study of the engineering history of a great war. We do not refer here to the fact that our late Ashantee expedition and the previous one to Magdala have been fitly described as being above all engineering operations; though that of itself might be enough. But it is a fact patent to the least observant that war by land and sea turns more and more to be a struggle conducted on scientific principles. The application to its purposes of steam and telegraph is but a part of a general movement, tending to substitute sound organization and scientific principles for mere brute force. Numbers have certainly not lost their power; but numbers without organization and science would mean mere useless waste. We in England are for ever complaining of our special difficulty of raising men, and boasting of the special superiority of our mechanical arts. It would be surely an act of superlatively folly for a people so circumstanced in times as

* *Operations of the German Engineers and Technical Troops during the Franco-German War of 1870-71.* By Captain A. Goetze, of the Prussian Engineers. Translated from the German by Colonel Graham, V.C., C.B., of the Royal Engineers. London: Henry S. King & Co.

troubled to neglect that branch of war in which we may most reasonably hope, not merely to rival, but to surpass all other nations.

LA ROCHEFOUCAULD'S MEMOIRS.*

THE present edition of La Rochefoucauld's Memoirs is the second volume of his works in M. Hachette's series, *Les Grands Écrivains de la France*. The first volume, which we have already noticed, contained the well-known Maxims, with ample notes and indexes. We shall recur to it briefly before opening the Memoirs in order to study the written portraits of the Duke which immediately follow the editor's preface. One of the portraits is from the hand of the Duke himself, the other is by the Cardinal de Retz. La Rochefoucauld describes his physical appearance as well as some of his mental peculiarities, but the Cardinal limits himself to a description of conduct and an estimate of capacity. For the amusement of the reader, the editor has added a portrait of the Cardinal by the Duke, the evident conclusion from this mutual portrait-painting being that neither of the artists had a very cordial admiration for his subject; indeed they are both almost *méchants*, but with the polite and delicate *méchanceté* of fine ladies. The Duke's portrait of himself is believed to have been published in 1658 or in the beginning of 1659, in which year it was printed. Few authors would venture to publish such a study during their own lives, but the Duke partially sheltered himself behind three initials, calling it the portrait of M. R. D.—the first letter standing for Monsieur, and the two others being the first and last letters of the author's well-known name. It is always a good thing to know something about the physical appearance of any one whose history occupies us; so we cannot do better than quote the portrait, which is probably more faithful than any that would be painted by an artist in colour, with so great a nobleman for his sitter:—

Je suis d'une taille médiocre, libre, et bien proportionnée. J'ai le teint brun, mais assez uni; le front élevé et d'une raisonnable grandeur; les yeux noirs, petits, et enfoncés, et les sourcils noirs et épais, mais bien tournés. Je serois fort empêché à dire de quelle sorte j'ai le nez fait, car il n'est ni camus, ni aquilin, ni gros, ni pointu, au moins à ce que je crois; tout ce que je sais, c'est qu'il est plutôt grand que petit, et qu'il descend un peu trop en bas. J'ai la bouche grande, et les lèvres assez rouges d'ordinaire, et ni bien ni mal taillées; j'ai les dents blanches, et passablement bien rangées. On m'a dit autrefois que j'avais un peu trop de menton: je viens de me tâter et de me regarder dans le miroir, pour savoir ce qui en est, et je ne sais pas trop bien qu'en juger. Pour le tour du visage, je l'ai ou carré, ou en ovale; lequel des deux il me seroit fort difficile de le dire. J'ai les cheveux noirs, naturellement frisés, et avec cela assez épais et assez longs pour pouvoir prétendre en belle tête. J'ai quelque chose de chagrin et de fier dans la mine: cela fait croire à la plupart des gens que je suis méprisant, quoique je ne le sois point du tout. J'ai l'action fort aisée, et même un peu trop, et jusques à faire beaucoup de gestes en parlant. Voilà naïvement comme je pense que je suis fait au dehors; et l'on trouvera, je crois, que ce qui je pense de moi là-dessus n'est pas fort éloigné de ce qui en est.

So much for the physical man. Then comes the moral portrait. The first and most striking peculiarity which the Duke notices in himself is his melancholy temperament, a temperament so melancholy indeed that in the course of three or four years he scarcely laughed more than three or four times. Here he makes an odd distinction between the melancholy which is in him naturally and the melancholy which comes to him from the outside. The first, he thinks, would be supportable and mild enough; but the second fills his imagination so much, and so occupies his mind, that during the greater part of his time he dreams and thinks without speaking a word, or, if he speaks, his mind hardly follows what he says. He is extremely reserved with people he does not know, and not very open with the greater number of those whom he does know. He seems perfectly aware that these characteristics are not likely to make him agreeable, and he suspects that, whatever he may do to correct his faults inwardly, there will always remain external traces of them on his countenance, "bad marks on the outside," as he expresses it. La Rochefoucauld does not hesitate to affirm that he is witty and intelligent, but says that his wit is spoiled by melancholy, which often prevents him from saying what he desires to say. He greatly enjoys conversation, however, in the sense of hearing people talk, especially when they talk earnestly and seriously, though at the same time he does not despise trifles, "bien dites," and appreciates light banter when conducted promptly and easily. He likes reading generally, especially the reading in which something may be found to form the mind and strengthen the soul. In one point we think he was decidedly mistaken, for he affirmed that ambition had no influence over him, whereas we have evidence enough in his Memoirs that he was intensely ambitious. He believed himself to be very courageous, declaring that he feared few things, and death not at all. This may have been true; he certainly had many opportunities of putting his courage to the test, and always behaved like a brave man. He was "peu sensible à la pitié," and wished he were utterly insensible to it, a wish which of itself is enough to prove the truth of the assertion which precedes it.

The portrait by the Cardinal de Retz is not more flattering, and it agrees in some points with that of the Duke himself. The Cardinal says, for example, that the Duke was never "guerrier, quoiqu'il fût très-soldat," meaning thereby that he was not

qualified to direct important operations, but carried himself manfully in the field. He describes an "air de honte et de timidité" as very characteristic of La Rochefoucauld, and this agrees with the Duke's own account of his perpetual absence of mind, for absence of mind makes people look shy and timid when they may not be so in reality. The Cardinal ends by saying that, if La Rochefoucauld had been content to know himself for what he was, and pass for no more than what he was, he might have been considered the most polished courtier of his age. The sum of the character as painted by the man himself, directly in the portrait, and indirectly in the Maxims and Memoirs, added to the keen observations (not altogether friendly) of De Retz, may be expressed in a few words. He was a combination of courtier, soldier, and philosopher, capable of much activity, oddly joined to habits of reflection which made him very absent. His nature was essentially a very cool one, almost cold, and yet endowed (as the Memoirs prove) with great personal energy. He had ample opportunities for becoming acquainted with the great world, and gained a most intimate knowledge of human nature in some of its varieties, so that his philosophy is not an ideal philosophy of the study, but a philosophy of reality as he found it in court and camp—a low kind of reality rather, yet that which he personally knew.

The Memoirs begin with the year 1624, and the first two pages contain two portraits, sketched in a very few words, of Louis XIII. and Richelieu:—

Le roi Louis XIII. avoit une santé foible, que les fatigues de la chasse avoient usée avant l'âge: ses incommodités augmentoient ses chagrins et les défauts de son humeur; il étoit sévère, dédaignant le monde; il vouloit être gouverné, et portoit impatiemment de l'être. Il avoit un esprit de détail appliqué uniquement à de petites choses, et ce qu'il savoit de la guerre convenoit plus à un simple officier qu'à un roi.

Then comes the sketch of Richelieu, but soon afterwards La Rochefoucauld returns to the King, for a line or two, that he may speak of his feelings about the Queen:—

Le Roi étoit naturellement jaloux, et sa jalousie, fomentée par celle du Cardinal de Richelieu, avoit suffi pour l'aigrir contre la Reine, quand même la stérilité de leur mariage et l'incompatibilité de leurs humeurs n'y auroient pas contribué.

The portrait of Richelieu is very vigorous and decided, but La Rochefoucauld does not distinguish, as De Retz did, between the Cardinal's art of conferring favours and a real liberality of spirit. De Retz said that he was not liberal, but gave more than he promised and seasoned his benefactions admirably:—

Le Cardinal de Richelieu gouvernoit l'État, et il devoit toute son élévation à la Reine mère. Il avoit l'esprit vaste et pénétrant, l'humeur âpre et difficile; il étoit libéral, hardi dans ses projets, timide pour sa personne. Il vouloit établir l'autorité du Roi et la sienne propre par la ruine des huguenots et des grandes maisons du Royaume, pour attaquer ensuite la maison d'Autriche et abaisser une puissance si redoutable à la France. Tout ce qui n'étoit pas dévoué à ses volontés étoit exposé à sa haine, et il ne gardoit point de bornes pour élever ses créatures ni pour perdre ses ennemis.

One of the first things which occur in the volume is the story of Buckingham and the Queen. Everybody knows that romantic page of history, if only through Alexandre Dumas, but it is interesting to read it in the narrative of a contemporary. Although the fame of Buckingham had still all its dazzling splendour at the time when the French Duke wrote, the latter never mastered the English orthography of the name, but wrote it always "Bouquin-quan." This way of spelling was, no doubt, simply phonetic, and therefore is interesting as evidence of the pronunciation of the Court in those days. The French are often careless about spelling names, especially foreign names, whether of men or places, but there are few prettier instances of it than this. We congratulate M. Gourdauld, the editor of this volume, on his extraordinary knowledge of foreign affairs, for he actually gives the correct orthography of the name in a note, without missing a letter. He also corrects "le comte d'Hollande," making it "le comte de Holland," which is certainly a nearer approach to accuracy. All this shows what a service M. Hachette is rendering to his countrymen by the publication of these excellent editions, which are calculated to teach them history and orthography at the same time.

The Court of France under Louis XIII. was not exactly the place to which a prudent English lady would have wished her husband to go as ambassador, especially if he were "jeune et bien fait," qualities much appreciated in an ambassador in those days. Lord Holland is sent to France as ambassador extraordinary to negotiate the marriage of the King, his master, with Henriette Marie, the French King's sister. At the French Court he meets with a certain great lady, the Duchess de Chevreuse, the Queen's bosom friend, who by all accounts must have been a very lively sort of woman:—

Madame de Chevreuse avoit beaucoup d'esprit, d'ambition, et de beauté; elle étoit galante, vive, hardie, entreprenante; elle se servoit de tous ses charmes pour réussir dans ses desseins, et elle a toujours porté malheur aux personnes qu'elle y a engagées.

This clever lady took a fancy to Lord Holland, and established a *liaison* with him, though her husband appears to have been at Court at the time; but, according to the courtly manners of those days, such an incident as the establishment of a new intimacy does not seem to have much troubled the serenity of husbands. The Duchess and the English nobleman had a fancy for inducing the Queen to enter into a similar arrangement with the Duke of Buckingham, "pour honorer leur passion," as La Rochefoucauld curiously puts it, though the Queen and Buckingham had never

* *Les Grands Écrivains de la France*. Nouvelles Editions, publiées sous la direction de M. Ad. Regnier, Membre de l'Institut, sur les manuscrits, les copies les plus authentiques, et les plus anciennes impressions, avec variantes, notes, notices, portraits, &c. La Rochefoucauld. Paris: Hachette.

seen each other. The most extraordinary thing about this scheme and the manner in which it was carried out appears to have been that Buckingham was persuaded to go to France for the express purpose of falling in love with the Queen. Lord Holland is described as being "jeune et bien fait," but Buckingham as "jeune, libéral, audacieux, et l'homme du monde le mieux fait."

Il se fit choisir pour venir en France épouser Madame au nom du Roi son maître, et il y arriva avec plus d'éclat, de grandeur et de magnificence que s'il n'eût été roi. La Reine lui parut encore plus aimable que son imagination ne lui avait pu représenter, et il parut à la Reine l'homme du monde le plus digne de l'aimer. Ils employèrent la première audience de cérémonie à parler d'affaires qui les touchaient plus vivement que celles des deux couronnes, et ils ne furent occupés que des intérêts de leur passion. Ces heureux commencements furent bientôt troublés.

Jealousies were awakened by this glittering star, and La Rochefoucauld tells us that, however brilliant may have been the Court of France, it was at once effaced "par l'éclat du duc de Bouquinguan." The pride and jealousy of Richelieu were wounded or awakened by the Queen's behaviour, so he communicated to the King all he knew or suspected, and the King and Richelieu hastened to get through with the marriage as soon as they possibly could, in order to be rid of Buckingham. He on his part did all in his power to remain as long as possible, and took all the opportunities for seeing the Queen which were afforded by his position as Ambassador, "sans ménager les chagrins du Roi." The Duke was even so "hardi et entreprenant" in his passion for the Queen that on one occasion, in a garden at Amiens, when her Majesty was resting in a summer-house after her walk, he went so far that she was obliged to call for her attendants. Her own conduct in the matter is not the least curious part of the story. She was delighted with Buckingham, and loved him more than she had ever loved anybody, but she was determined to remain faithful to her husband, at least literally, if not in spirit. Buckingham had no such scruples, but did all he could to persuade the Queen to be his mistress. Probably his imagination may have been excited by the romantic interest which would be attached to his name in a dissolute age by such a brilliant "bonne fortune"; but he must have been madly in love at last, when, after leaving Amiens and the Queen, on his way to England, he rode back in great haste, without the shadow of an excuse, merely that he might see her once again:—

La Reine étoit au lit : il entra dans sa chambre, et, se jetant à genoux devant elle et fondant en larmes, il lui tenoit les mains ; la Reine n'étoit pas moins touchée, lorsque la comtesse de Launoy, sa dame d'honneur, s'approcha du duc de Bouquinguan et lui fit apporter un siège en lui disant qu'on ne parloit point à genoux à la Reine. Elle fut témoin du reste de la conversation, qui fut courte. Le duc de Bouquinguan remonta à cheval en sortant de chez la Reine, et reprit le chemin d'Angleterre.

Then we come to the well-known story of the diamond tags. Richelieu, being jealous of the Queen's preference for Buckingham, and knowing that the latter had had an attachment for the Countess of Carlisle, determined to employ the Countess as his agent. It is better to let La Rochefoucauld tell this romantic story in his own words:—

Le Cardinal sut ménager si adroitement l'esprit fier et jaloux de cette femme, par la conformité de leurs sentiments et de leurs intérêts, qu'elle devint le plus dangereux espion du duc de Bouquinguan. L'envie de se venger de son infidélité et de se rendre nécessaire au Cardinal la portèrent à tenter toutes sortes de voies pour lui donner des preuves certaines de ce qu'il soupçonnait de la Reine. Le duc de Bouquinguan étoit, comme j'ai dit, galant et magnifique ; il prenoit beaucoup de soin de se parer aux assemblées ; la comtesse de Carlisle, qui avoit tant d'intérêt de l'observer, aperçut bientôt qu'il affectoit de porter des ferrets de diamants qu'elle ne connoissoit pas ; elle ne douta point que la Reine ne les lui eût donnés ; mais pour être encore plus assurée, elle prit le temps, à un bal, d'entretenir en particulier de duc de Bouquinguan, et de lui couper les ferrets, dans le dessein de les envoyer au Cardinal.

Buckingham becomes aware of the theft the same evening, concludes at once who has committed it, closes the ports of England, and sends them to the Queen by a special messenger, before the ports are opened, so as to be beforehand with Lady Carlisle. In the earlier editions of the Memoirs it is only said that Buckingham closed the ports, but in this edition we have "tous les ports." The whole story of the diamond tags rests, we believe, on the evidence of La Rochefoucauld alone. It is as romantic as possible, and has become popular through the effective use which Dumas made of it in fiction. La Rochefoucauld evidently believed it to be true, which proves at least the reputation for energy, determination, and devotion to the Queen which Buckingham had left behind him at the Court of France. The author of these Memoirs adds that, when Buckingham went with a fleet to succour La Rochelle, Richelieu accused the Queen of having concerted this enterprise with the English Duke.

The difficulty of reviewing a book of memoirs such as these of La Rochefoucauld is simply the abundance of material which they contain, and the great number of persons referred to. A simple catalogue of these would almost fill our space. The admirable index to the volume, for which every reader owes M. Gourdault great thanks, alone occupies twenty-two pages with names of persons and places. It is to be regretted that La Rochefoucauld did not divide his work into chapters. A modern editor would hardly dare to do this ; but a synopsis of each year would be valuable. M. Gourdault has taken care to put the date over every page ; it would have been better to place the date in the margin, and reserve the top of the page for a brief indication of its contents, instead of re-

peating the word *Mémoires* 432 times. The persons of whom most is said in the course of the volume are the Prince de Condé, the Cardinal Mazarin, Anne of Austria, Gaston Duke of Orleans, Louis XIII., Louis XIV., the Duchess de Longueville, the two Cardinals de Retz and de Richelieu, and the author, who always speaks of himself in the third person, first as the Prince de Marillac, and afterwards as Duke de La Rochefoucauld, when the title came to him through the death of his father. The most interesting part of the action is that which concerns the Fronde, and La Rochefoucauld's participation in it. There are also interminable Court intrigues, on which additional light is thrown by the *Apologie* which the editor has wisely reprinted at the close of the volume ; but we have no space to enter into such complicated matters as these, and can only recommend the edition before us as being by far the best which has hitherto appeared. The general impression which these Memoirs leave upon the reader is that the author devoted great courage and craft to very small purposes.

SONGS OF TWO WORLDS.*

THIS new series of *Songs of Two Worlds* contains, besides a number of shorter pieces, three poems of an important character—"Evensong," a speculative and quasi-Lucretian poem of some forty pages ; "From Hades," a classical sketch, which strikes us as the type, and perhaps the germ, of a future poetic success ; and an enthusiastic ode to Free Rome, which, in spite of its rather hackneyed subject, has merits that entitle it to a remembrance denied to the mass of such compositions. The first-named poem shows power, thought, and courage to grapple with the profoundest problems. A cold low whisper of doubt comes at even-song over a dreamer on a churchyard slope, silencing the echo of hymns and dimming the glories of the sunset ; and the old controversy of faith and doubt is argued over again with much mastery of verse and poetic power, the triumph being of course on the side of faith. As the goal is neared our poet is rapt into a dream of a more perfect Christianity:—

Marching on through an ordered life in the strength of a steadfast will ; and the conclusion of his final outburst is as picturesque as it is powerful. Yet we doubt whether it is by this class of poems, which are more or less experimental *tours de force*, that the author of *Songs of Two Worlds* is most likely to retain the ear of the public, refreshing though it may be to find him taking the side of belief, and not bitten with the common craze of poets, that gloom and doubt are of the essence of their calling. In the "Ode to Free Rome" again we acknowledge worthy treatment of the subject, and passionate expression of generous sympathy. The contrast between the old Rome, the dust of empires, and the new is forcibly drawn ; the "freeing of the sweet South," in p. 147, is a spirited outburst ; and the poetry of scorn has ample scope in tracing the motley mass that helped the Pope to carry his dogma of Infallibility:—

The Jesuit suborned from every clime,
The stolid Eastern left behind of time,
The supple Italian mad for place ;
And those the shame of every freer race
Who come to hate the liberty they know,
And thoughts and lives that grow ;
Who into freemen's gatherings slip—
Smooth actors false, who play their part
With tolerance upon the lip,
And tyranny at heart.

Our poet, it will be seen, is a good hater. Yet we incline to hope for the development of his poetic career rather in such finished and highly-wrought pictures as "From Hades," a leaf, as it were, out of a classical *εκκοπαιρία*, a dream of Actæon, Orpheus, and Eurydice, and Endymion in the Shades below. The poet here exhibits a congenial grace of description and a delicate touch which only a true scholar, who also possessed an adequate sense of the requirements of English poetry, could apply. Here he is quite at home ; so much so indeed that few modern or neo-classical studies in this kind have realized in equal measure the art of reproducing Greek myths in English guise and interpretation. The conception of each of the characters is so vivid, and the moral of each one's crowning mishap or adventure so touchingly drawn by himself, that the author might be trusted to tread classic paths of song without fear of swerving from the clear and statuesque grace of the models, even if he were minded to make them the subject of a larger poem. Here is an extract from the vision of Endymion, in which the version of the myth adopted by Cicero (*Tusc. Q. i. p. 38*) that Selene, enamoured of his beauty, sent him to sleep that she might be able to kiss him unobserved, appears to have been followed. The shepherd from his eternal sleep on Mount Latmos thus regards his doom:—

Let I judge it best indeed
To seek in life, as now I know I sought,
Some fair impossible Love, which slays our life,
Some high ideal raised too high for man,
And, failing, to grow mad or cease to be,
Than to decline as they do who have found
Broad-paunched content, and weal, and happiness ;
And so an end. For one day, as I know,
The high aim unfulfilled, fulfils itself ;
The deep unsatisfied thirst is satisfied ;
And through this twilight, broken suddenly.

* *Songs of Two Worlds*. Third Series. By a New Writer. London : Henry S. King & Co. 1875.

The inmost Heaven, the latent stars of God,
The Moon of Love, the Sun of Life; and I,
I who pine here—I on the Latman hill
Shall soar aloft and find them.

This sentiment is the same as that which inspires a song at p. 66 beginning with "Beam on me, fair Ideal, beam on me"; and we may say here that the songs in this volume have in general the same excellence as those in the former series. One of them rings some sprightly changes on the rhyme of folly with melancholy, in the fashion of an Elizabethan dramatist; and the rest hit, for the most part, the required combination of a bright idea with brief words and winning numbers.

Songs and classical sketches, however, do not content a singer of our author's aspirations. He is never more worth a hearing than when he dwells on the "Food of Song," the "Birth of Verse," and similar subjects, and allows us an insight into his views of what should be a poet's scope and standard; not idealities, not Nature's smiles or frowns, not the "clang and rush of mightier thought," so much as,

Rather mid the throng
Of toiling men,
To find the food and sustenance of song
Spread by hidden hands, again, and yet again;
Where'er he goes, by crowded city street
He fares thro' springing fancies sad and sweet.

In keeping with this ideal is a poem entitled "The Youth of Thought," in which a contrast is drawn between the gayer morning of the world when myth or fable satisfied men's craving after light, and its mellow earnest evening, our "living present":—

While, if we seek to live again
In careless lives the Pagan charm,
We only prove a life-long pain
For that clear conscience void of harm.
For in the manhood of God's days
We live, and not in careless youth;
The essence more than form we praise,
And Beauty moves us less than Truth.
From youth to age: till cycles hence
Another and a higher spring,
And, with a truer innocence,
Again the world shall think and sing.

The bulk of the poems on what we may call phases of home life and social subjects are also in an equally earnest strain. In the "Children of the Street," the author touches a chord like that he touched in the "Organ Boy" of the second series. "The Enigma," another street-inspired strain, is a pathetic protest against the unevenness of man's justice in the case of those outcasts of the pavement on whom society is righteously severe while their accomplices go scot-free. Why should there be

A high post, and respect, and wealth
For the one who is guilty indeed,
While the innocent walks by stealth
Through rough places with feet that bleed?

From the same generous impulse, the strength of which in the poet's soul and brain is well described in "The Birth of Verse," spring such touching little pictures of life in its sadder aspects as "At Chambers" and "Frederick"; and—going from human to animal suffering—the protest against reckless vivisection which he has addressed "To the Tormentors." We are inclined to doubt, however, whether the author's "milk of human kindness" does not betray him into sentimental weakness in the pieces headed "Wasted" and "Souls in Prison." But it is easy to see that these are the rare extravagances of a tender and deeply sympathetic nature, whose healthier utterances are to be found in "The Home Altar," "At Last," and the ode "To my Motherland." "A Separation Deed" shows how the writer, in a spirit of satire and irony, has been able to blend the language of poetry and conveyancing. The last poem in the volume, describing Dynevor, Dryslyn, and the Towy, and other Welsh scenes, is addressed "To my Motherland," and the reference which it contains to

Mona, from whose fresh, wind-swept pastures come
My grandsire, bard and patriot, like in name,
Whose verse his countrymen still love to sing
At bidding-feast or rustic junketing.

will be to many a sufficient indication of the writer's personality, although he continues to be anonymous in the title-page. Perhaps, however, a wider sympathy will be elicited by the citation of the closing stanzas of "At Last," an expression of faith in the disembodied spirit's continued interest in the scenes and persons left behind on earth. After setting forth the negative view, he proceeds:—

Nay, 'tis not so indeed.
With the last fluttering of the failing breath
The clay-cold form doth breed
A viewless essence far too fine for death;
And ere one voice can mourn,
On upward pinions borne,
They are hidden, they are hidden in some thin air
Far from corruption, far from care,
Where through a veil they view their former scene,
Only a little touched by what has been.
Touched but a little, and yet
Conscious of every change that doth befall,
By constant change beset,
The creatures of this tiny whirling ball,
Filled with a higher being,
Dowered with a clearer seeing,
Risen to a vaster scheme of life,
To wider joys and nobler strife,
Viewing our little human hopes and fears,
As we our children's fleeting smiles and tears.

Then whether with fire they burn
This dwelling-house of mine when I am fled,
And in a marble urn
My ashes rest by my beloved dead,
Or in the sweet cold earth
I pass from death to birth,
And pay kind Nature's life-long debt
In heartsease and in violet—
In charnel-house or hidden ocean wave,
Where'er I lie, I shall not scorn my grave.

Taken altogether it may be said that the new series of *Songs of Two Worlds* is fully equal to the standard of the other two, and it is to be hoped that the author is not altogether serious in his apparent hesitation as to continuing his poetic labours.

NORWAY.*

THE attractions of Norway are now so generally appreciated that there must be a steady demand for guide-books to that region, and there will probably be many persons who will be anxious to ascertain whether Mr. Tönsberg's addition to an already pretty numerous stock is distinguished by any novel feature. One of its peculiarities is that it is liberally provided with illustrations; but it is doubtful whether this adds to the practical utility of the volume. Portability is, we should say, one of the principal requisites for a Handbook for Travellers, and it is plain that numerous woodcuts must seriously add to its bulk. Again, what corresponding advantage does the traveller acquire in exchange for this increase in weight? None that we can discern; for he most assuredly does not require the image when he has the original before his eyes. Travellers frequently return with photographs or engravings as reminiscences of scenes they have visited; but to supply themselves with such things before starting seems, to say the least of it, unnecessary. We are forced to surmise, then, that the cuts in this volume are intended as advertisements of the charms of Norway, if they have been inserted with any definite idea at all. Tourists are to be allured by a faint portraiture of the treat which is in store for them. If this be so, the illustrations are perfectly honest, for the artist does not exaggerate the beauties he delineates. The engravings are, in short, excellent of their kind, and recall at a glance the scenes they are intended to represent. Considerable boldness is, we think, displayed in entering the lists against such well-appointed antagonists as Murray and Baedeker; though, as the original is in Norse, the work may not be designed principally for the English public. Murray's Handbook to the three Scandinavian kingdoms is of dimensions about equal to Mr. Tönsberg's. It follows that the latter, which refers to Norway alone, must be either more complete or more diffuse. There is a class, however, for whose requirements it will not be too minute in its details—that of pedestrian tourists. Murray is quite comprehensive enough for the ordinary traveller who keeps to the main arteries of communication, and who may possibly include parts of the three kingdoms in one and the same tour. But for a pedestrian far greater detail is indispensable. In a thinly peopled country, where accommodation is not always to be obtained, accurate information regarding distances and places must be had, and these are here laid down with great precision. A good example of this is to be found in the section devoted to the Jotunfelde, or Giant Mountains, a part of Norway but recently explored by travellers. Here will be found every particular needful for a trip amongst these mountain fastnesses, even down to the articles of personal equipment and the proper weight of the packed knapsack. Ladies, we are told, need not dread undertaking a tour in this distant mountain range. Nor should the most timorous tremble on finding a "pocket pistol" and a "sheath-knife" amongst the outfit recommended, for the first is mentioned in close connexion with "two small bottles of rum or cognac," and is sometimes carried even by travellers in England, and the other is only a clasp-knife, an innocent implement which is often useful in more ways than one.

The work commences with a concise account of the climate and natural history, the manners and customs of the inhabitants, and the state of literature and art. We miss an introductory historical sketch, a surprising omission when we consider that the book comes from a native pen. But the scientific part of this section is satisfactory enough. A singular combination of physical conditions renders Norway fit for the abode of man. From its latitude it would be as barren and inhospitable as Greenland, were it not for the sea which washes its shores, and forms a great reservoir of heat, which is constantly being given off into the atmosphere. For the greater part of the year the temperature of the ocean, on the west coast, is higher than that of the air. This high temperature is constantly maintained by fresh supplies of heated water from the Gulf Stream; and a succession of banks, which extend far out seawards, prevent this surface stream from losing its heat by contact with a mass of cold water below. Vast quantities of aqueous vapour are also generated from the same cause, which, though they lend a gloomy aspect to the Northern skies, hinder radiation during the long nights of winter, and thus materially assist in rendering the climate more genial. To such an extent is this the case that on some parts of the west coast there are four cloudy days to every clear one. But, descending the eastern slope of the great

* *Norway: an Illustrated Handbook for Travellers.* Edited by Christian Tönsberg, Christiania. London: Trübner & Co. 1875.

mountain ranges on the coast, and approaching the flatter districts, the climate becomes less humid, and the number of fair and cloudy days is about evenly balanced, though, as we recede from the sea, the cold becomes of course proportionally severe.

The general plan of this guide-book is as follows:—From Christiania as a centre radiate seven routes which traverse the interior as far as the western coast; and by selecting one of these, with reference to the amount of time he may have at his disposal, the traveller may view from carriage or steamer (for fortunately railways have not been constructed to any considerable extent) panoramas of scenery which vary materially from each other in their essential particulars. The coast route is afterwards adopted; and, starting again from the capital, we are conducted along the western coast as far as the Russian frontier, exploring the deep recesses of the numerous fiords as we proceed.

No more delightful base of operations than Christiania could be selected; and the judicious visitor will not quit it until its attractions have been thoroughly explored. The loveliness of its situation and the romance of its surroundings could hardly be surpassed. Before us extends the vast expanse of a fiord which sweeps up seventy miles from the ocean before it washes the foundations of the city. We stand under the grey walls of the ancient feudal castle of Akershus; in the foreground lies the isle of Hovedø with its ruined convent, founded by Cistercian monks from Lincoln in 1147; on our right the royal villa of Oscar's Hall, whose Gothic architecture, though of modern date, harmonizes well with the scene; whilst on our left towers a gigantic wooded mass of gneiss, the Ekeberg. Nor should the environs of the capital be neglected. The *Seater*, or chalet, of Frogner commands a fine expanse of fiord and fell. This is not a *seater* as it is usually understood in Norway—a miserable hut in the mountains inhabited by herdsmen in summer whilst grazing their cattle—but a conventional *seater*, suggesting no ideas of discomfort. The Maridal Lake should also be the object of a morning promenade; a small brilliant sheet of water, surrounded by pine-covered heights, lying about two miles from the city, which it supplies with water. A pleasant two days' excursion may be made by going down the fiord by steamer to Frederikstad and visiting the mighty cataract of the Glommen, near Sarpsborg. Should the weather prove favourable, the transit up and down the fiord will alone amply repay the labour; and should the traveller feel disposed to prolong his trip, he may wind his way among the precipitous rocks which stud the coast to Frederikshald, mount to the fortress of Frederiksten, and visit the monument which marks the spot where Charles XII. of Sweden met his death.

Perhaps, however, the most advantageous route to select is that which leads from Christiania, along Lake Mjösen, the Gudbrand Valley, and the Dovre Mountains, to Trondhjem, returning by the coast as far as Bergen or Christiansand, where steamers call on their way to Hull or London. This plan will be found to include most points of interest. Trondhjem, the ancient Nidaros, the former capital, and still the coronation-place of the Norwegian Kings, deserves particular attention. There stands the fine old cathedral, founded by Olaf Kyrr, or the Peaceful, in 1093, and in which, as we learn from the Saga which bears his name, he himself was interred. Under the high altar were preserved for centuries in a massive silver shrine the bones of St. Olaf, that sanguinary missionary of the Gospel, till they were carried off by Swedish marauders from across the frontier of Jämtland. Not far off, in Værdal, lies Stiklestad, where a bloody engagement was fought between the same Olaf and the rebel peasants of Trondhjem, in which the former was defeated and lost his life. At Hlade dwelt Earl Hakon, "The Mighty," and Melhus, or Medallhus, was the residence of that Asbjørn who threatened Hakon the Good with deposition if he persisted in his endeavours to introduce the Christian faith into Norway. The Thrøndelag, or union of tribes inhabiting the surrounding district, was the pith and marrow of a noble and martial race.

Pursuing our course southwards we pass the Sogne Fiord, which stretches nearly a hundred miles into the interior of the country. Archaeologists have fixed upon this as the scene of the famous Frithiof's Saga. A projecting point, Vangnes, is pointed out as the home of the hero of the story, whilst opposite lies the lovely Balestrand, the supposed site of Baldur's temple. Bergen, the ancient Björgvin, or the "pasture between the mountains," is also an interesting city, possessing a fine cathedral. It was formerly one of the chief depôts of the Hanseatic League, and still does a considerable trade, chiefly in fish and train-oil. We should not, however, advise a visit during the "meeting times," which occur during the summer months, for then the Nordland fishermen descend on the town with their unsavoury cargoes, and business becomes active. The town at these periods is all bustle, but we are told that our "olfactory organs must not be too sensitive, for the stench of fish and oil is 'a caution.'"

Sportsmen will still find an attractive field of operations in certain districts of Norway, though the Government appears determined to guard the national property from the spoliation of foreigners. By Article VII. of the Game Regulations, "foreigners are not entitled without permission to carry on any hunting or fishing whatever in the territory of the realm." Of the larger sorts of game, the wolf, the bear, and the lynx exist in sufficient numbers in the extensive forests which in many parts still shroud the face of the country. Wolves have diminished to an unaccountable extent during the last twenty years, and may now be regarded as the rarest of Norwegian carnivora. The bear also retires as the forests which are his home disappear before the axe; but he is still

to be found pretty frequently in the northern Amts. The elk, as his natural foes, the wolf and bear, thin out, seems to multiply; he is besides exceptionally protected by legislation. He is found in the eastern Amts, and never inhabits the west, which is the home of the red deer. Large herds of reindeer are found on the mountain tracts which divide the east from the west. These are, however, subject to the caprice or cruelty of the peasant, who will sometimes discharge his breechloading rifle at long range into a herd, perhaps maiming many animals which he cannot hope to take, and which perish of their wounds in the solitude of the forest. The reindeer is said to prey upon the lemming, a rodent which makes its appearance at certain intervals in countless multitudes. With its cloven hoof it tears open the stomach of its victim and devours the moss and other vegetable matter with which it is filled.

It is to be regretted that the pages of this work are disfigured by pretty numerous errors in orthography. These arise from the fact that it has been translated into English by a Norwegian, without proper revision. The iteration of words misspelt, such as "hakney," "macrel," "colosal," "olefactory," is somewhat irritating. It is also advisable that translations should be complete, and should leave nothing to conjecture. Thus, *Søndre Trondhjems Amt* would be far more intelligible to the uninitiated in Norse as *South Trondhjem Amt*; *Haralds Støtten*, as the Pillar of Harald, &c. These, however, are minor blemishes, and do not much affect the practical value of the book, which may be confidently recommended to travellers.

THE HIGH MILLS.*

"A SKETCH," we are told in a note to the first volume of this novel, "entitled *The High Mills*, by the same author, appeared some time since in *Good Words*, and although that sketch is partly incorporated with the present work, yet the stories are in no sense the same, as the latter contains nearly two-thirds more matter than the former." We shall next be told that Mr. Coxwell's balloon when full of gas and ready to rise is in no sense the same as the case of silk that half-an-hour or so before, when only one-third full, had been flapping about idly in the wind. Or better still, we shall be told that a paper bag when empty is in no sense the same as the same bag when some idle boy has puffed it out, and is ready to strike it on a comrade's back with a loud report. There is, indeed, much more wind, but there is no more matter. We cannot but believe that in any case *The High Mills* must have been tedious, unspeakably tedious. Now tediousness is far better when it is all bestowed in one volume than in three, and therefore we regret that, if we must criticize the story at all, it was not our lot to criticize it as it appeared in *Good Words*. There is a sickly sentimentality running through the whole three volumes that cloy the appetite almost before the end of the first chapter is reached; and yet the chapters are very short—nine pages or so each. If we must dine on sweets, we should not think the better of our cook if he told us that in the first sketch of his dinner he had used only sugar, but that by "incorporating" treacle and honey he had so increased the bill of fare that it contained nearly two-thirds more matter. We remember the story of a man in prison who was killed by being fed on nothing but the crumb of new bread. For a while he had supported life by eating only the crust, but when this had been noticed his loaf was given him with the crust first cut off, and death soon followed. His fate was sad indeed; but, after all, what is bodily suffering compared with that of the mind? He died of new bread. We are fed on these sickly stories, and, tortured though we are, death does not come to relieve us. It has taken us a whole fortnight to get through *The High Mills*, or, perhaps we should say, to swallow it down. When we had read half-a-dozen chapters or so, like the grocer's apprentice at the end of his first week, we had a surfeit of sweetness. We threw the book aside, and vowed we could not read another chapter. A fortnight, as we have said, had to pass before we could bear the sight of it again, and then, indeed, we managed to struggle through to the end. We cannot say we have read it; we have read in it. And yet, we have no doubt, the book will have its readers find that they have tears. Young ladies who can pass with all the indifference that comes from familiarity the scenes of real suffering that open out to them every day and all around, find the April in their eyes when they hear of the unreal woes of some most unnatural hero.

Such a hero is Michael Swift, the miller's man of the story before us. In the opening chapter he is seen making his way towards the High Mills, which are described as "looking like two pinned insects writhing on the hill." It is almost a pity that so pretty a comparison as this was not worked into the title of the book. *The High Mills; or, Two Pinned Insects Writhing on the Hill*, would not have read at all amiss. The miller Ambray was, in his old age, going down in the world. His only son George had set off for London to be an artist, and for a long time no tidings had come of him. The Mills belonged to the miller's wicked sister-in-law, Mrs. Moon, and she was on the point of turning him out. Her property she intended to leave to

* *The High Mills*. By Katherine Saunders, Author of "Gideon's Rock," "Joan Merryweather," &c. 3 vols. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1875.

her favourite niece Nora, who was engaged to George. Michael from the very beginning is an utter mystery—a mystery to the miller and his family as well as to the reader. He asks for employment at the mill, and by his industry saves the miller from ruin, but he works, not as a journeyman, but as a sentimentalist. The first day he goes into the mill “he shut the door gently, as gently and reluctantly as if some bright form, soft, odour-breathing, and lovely, had just floated out, and he feared that the edges of a silken train might still be lingering on the threshold.” Not, indeed, that any bright, soft, odour-breathing, lovely form had ever been in the mill or in Michael’s brain. At last it turns out that in a scuffle he had killed the miller’s son, and that he had come to the mill to do his best by steady grinding to atone for his crime, and to fill George’s place. This secret, of course, is kept well in till the third volume, so that the reader for two whole volumes has the great and uncommon satisfaction of not in the least understanding the hero’s doings. He is not happy, that is clear. It is before long no less clear that by the end of the third volume he will be made happy by marrying Nora. For the wicked old woman with all her money, there is evidently stored up somewhere in the same volume that convenient fit of apoplexy which, when matters look at their worst, puts a hero and a heroine so much at their ease. Michael does not know, as the reader does, of the happiness that awaits him, and so “in the sadness of his exile was obliged to hang his head and own that, grain of human dust, as he called himself, the story of that grain was more to him than the story of all creation—the span of its actual existence larger to him than eternity.”

It is a pity that ladies before they begin to write novels do not take a hint from Molière and his housekeeper. They might try if they could write a recipe for making a pudding in language that could be understood by their cook. At first, no doubt they would utterly fail; but with time and patience they would find that it is possible to learn how to write something like sense. There is, however, this objection, that when once they have learnt how to write sense, they would find it a very hard matter to fill three volumes. “The span of the actual existence of a grain of human dust,” and sentences of a like kind, help wonderfully, when incorporated with “a sketch,” to swell it out to three times its former size. Michael steps out of a house, as journeymen millers occasionally do step, and he looks back, as journeymen millers occasionally do look back. He sees “the great wind-swept meadows, clean and ready for their summer wealth, from the house to the sea, and the poplars swaying their heads against the sky.” If every time a journeyman miller steps out of a house and looks back we are to be told what he sees, even if the simplest of language is used, a book may soon be filled up. Michael continues his walk and arrives—and here the author does not offend against the laws of probability—at a garden. “Some snowdrops shivered in the wintry garden, looking lost and strange, like pale spirits who had mistaken the day of resurrection, and come forth before the world was ready.” We cannot help wondering, by the way, why the garden was not, like the meadows, ready for its summer wealth. Why should it suggest pale spirits, and not a summer wealth of summer cabbages? Michael goes to sleep on a Monday night, and—here again quite true to nature—opened his eyes on a Tuesday morning. When he woke, “he saw”—but we will stake our life on it no journeyman miller before or after ever saw the like—“the upper half of the poplar at the corner of the mill-field stirring in golden light, tremulously—exultantly, like the wand of some wizard alchemist in a crucible when a long-looked-for change has come.” He goes to meet a wicked old blind man by the seashore. The old sinner appeared to him there “less repulsively wicked than pitifully, almost pathetically, insignificant, and helpless.” But here we shall let the author tell in her own words the thoughts of this wonderful journeyman miller:—

Perhaps, Michael thought, it could hardly be otherwise than that any form of evil *should* shrink and appear to diminish and wither here, in these grand front ranks of nature merging into heaven, from which they seem curtailed only by excess of light.

Or might it be, Michael wondered, that even the man whom he had thought as unlikely to change his sins as the leopard his spots, had not been able to sit here without receiving inwardly *some* cleansing touches from that spirit of strong, fresh purity that breathes here always, making the sands so fair, and revealing the thousand faint, sweet tints, and tender graining of the pebbles?

It is unlucky that all this finery of language is sometimes sadly spoilt by the author’s ignorance of grammar. She wishes to tell us that the journeyman was so keen a worker that he often worked the mill at night. She describes him as “laying (*sic*) in wait to catch and yoke to his master’s service each wind that moaned across the dark and solitary downs, or came sighing up the valley, moist and heavy from the sea.” Whether the wind moans across the downs and sighs up the valley, or moans up the valley and sighs across the downs, we leave for the author to settle as she pleases. She may, too, if she pleases, yoke the wind, whether moaning or sighing, to the sails of the windmill which it blows round. But, in the name of Lindley Murray, who still, we believe, presides over grammar in young ladies’ schools, we raise our solemn protest when we read of any one, even a mysterious journeyman miller, “laying” in wait. When Michael was giving his account of the death of George, we are told that the “manifest additions” he made to his “heart-learned story threw a sort of lurid reality upon the moment or thing which it concerned.” What a lurid reality is we are not so presumptuous as to pretend to understand, as the old lady said when she was asked if she understood the sermon she

had so greatly admired. If, however, an error in grammar throws a sort of lurid reality over the author’s narrative, we at once withdraw our objection to it. One more quotation to illustrate the state of mind of the journeyman miller, and we have done. He was spending a night in the fields, and he heard the cornrake and the crickets:—

Sometimes—but very seldom—a low rich murmur went through and through the corn, as if these noisy creatures had disturbed the earth’s slumber, and made her heart sigh under its rich burden, and whisper “Hush!” And the whisper spread from field to field all over the dark undulations of the valley; the wheat uttered it mellowly; the barley rustled with it more than the wheat; the rye whispered it more airily than all; the long fields bore it to the sea; the sea turned the small, low “Hush” into a mighty one.

We had set out with the intention of giving our readers a full account of the plot of this wonderful story. The author delights in similes. May we then venture to say that we soon found ourselves so hopelessly sunk in a very slough of words that it has been with the utmost difficulty that we have escaped out of it, and, throwing aside our purpose, struggled at length on to firm land.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,081, JULY 31, 1875:

The Government and Mr. Plimsoll.	
The Labour Laws.	The Meeting of the Mayors.
Bishop Thirlwall.	France. The Debate on Inclosures.
	The Assaults Bill.
	Foreign Poor Laws.

Bishop Thirlwall as an Historian.	Dramatic Conditions.
The Archaeological Institute at Canterbury.	Dressmaking as a Fine Art.
The “Centennial Exposition.”	The Queen Anne Craze.
Another Muddle.	Metropolitan Streets and Roads.

Malleson’s Native States of India.

Murray’s Handbooks for Northumberland.	The Life of St. Teresa.
The Engineer History of the War of 1870-71.	La Rochefoucauld’s Memoirs.
Songs of Two Worlds.	Norway.
	The High Mills.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,080, JULY 24, 1875:

Public Business—Mr. Gladstone on Economy—The French Assembly—The Agricultural Holdings Bill—Colonists to Order—The Cobden Club—Rain Water—District Universities.

The Byron Memorial—The Modern Mother—Guests at the O’Connell Centenary—Knightsbridge Barracks—French Dramatic Journalism—The Booking-Office Nuisance—The Maine Liquor Law—“P. P.” Betting.

Warburton’s Edward III.—Shakespeare’s Library—Harris’s Elements of Roman Law—Denzil Place—Pulman’s Book of the Axe—Major Butler’s Akimfo—Comin’ Thro’ the Rye—American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—PICTURE GALLERY, open all the year round, for the Reception and Sale of Pictures by celebrated Artists of the English and Continental Schools. Sold Works are removed immediately.—Apply for particulars to Mr. C. W. WALK, Superintendent of the Gallery.

DORE’S GREAT PICTURE of “CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM,” with “Dream of Pilate’s Wife,” “The Night of the Crucifixion,” “La Vierge,” “Soldiers of the Cross,” “Christian Martyrs,” “Gaming Table,” &c.—**DORE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street.** Ten to Six. Admission, 1s.